

# The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JULY 22, 1897.

## The Week.

While Chairman Dingley was explaining on Monday how the House conferees on the tariff bill had got the better of the Sugar Trust, Wall Street was betting millions of dollars that the Sugar Trust had got the better of Dingley and of the United States of America—betting and putting up the money. It is impossible for anybody but experts to understand what is meant in the way of protection to the sugar-refining monopoly by the conference report on this subject. Dingley himself does not know, but the sugar-refiners and speculators knew perfectly well, and when they put up the price of Sugar stock 11 points in a single day, it may be assumed that they had good reasons for doing so. In the babel of tongues at Washington an idea seems to prevail that the Trust and their speculative following, including Senators themselves, are trying to make it appear that they have won a victory when they have not; that they are boasting on the streets and in the hotel corridors how they kept up the fight in the conference and finally got all that they expected, with a mere change of words which was not a change of substance. Such boasting, of course, excites the ire of the Dingleyites, and they "hurl back" the insinuation.

Undoubtedly there will be much hurling of charges and epithets on the stump this fall apropos of the sugar tariff, but all arguments will sink out of sight in presence of the fact that when the present Congress took hold of this subject American Sugar Refining common stock stood at 110, and that when the conference report was made it stood at 146. Result: net gain of 36 points on \$37,000,000 of stock, mostly water, or a gain of \$13,000,000. It may be said, and it is doubtless true, that a large part of this gain is due to the stock of sugar that these people have imported in advance. For this also Congress is responsible. The McKinley bill of 1890 set out with the proposition of a free breakfast table, a free sugar-bowl, and all that. The Dingley bill has ended with a tax of nearly two cents per pound and a bonus to the Sugar Trust of \$13,000,000 in one lump. That is a free sugar-bowl with a vengeance. The truth is that the sugar-refiners do not need one atom of protection and ought not to have it. The one-eighth differential that the Dingley bill proposed was a sheer gratuity, all the more outrageous since the Trust itself was a confessed monopoly. Even if we allow Mr. Dingley's claim that he

has defeated the unholy conspiracy in the Senate, he has still to answer the charge of putting an unnecessary burden on the consumers of sugar for the benefit of millionaires. The only excuse for this act is that he was obliged to do this in order to make the bill consistent with itself. That is to say, the bill was a device to make a distribution of the national earnings among private individuals, with the possible chance of getting some more revenue for the Government, and it would not be fair to leave out anybody who had contributed largely to the funds of the last campaign.

Mr. Dingley finally abandoned his absurd contentions about books, and consented to allow their free importation when twenty years old or when printed in languages other than English. It must have been hard for him to drop his powerful argument that we printed in this country "an abundance" of books in foreign languages. But we are too much pleased to see the proposed tax on knowledge disappear to care very much who plucked this feather out of Mr. Dingley's headdress. The tax on art is still proudly waving in it, however, and this should be enough to reconcile the party of intelligence to free books. Free books and free art too would be a concession to the educated and to the interests of popular culture quite indefensible on the stump.

The Paris award as printed on page 112 of the Diplomatic Correspondence of 1894, shows that there is no requirement or even advice to either of the parties to maintain ships in the waters of Bering Sea. The first article provides that the Governments of the United States and of Great Britain shall forbid their citizens and subjects respectively to kill, capture, or pursue at any time or in any manner whatever the animals called fur seals, within a zone of sixty miles around the Pribilof Islands, inclusive of the territorial waters. The second article says that they shall forbid their citizens and subjects to kill, capture, or pursue in any manner whatever, during the season extending each year from the 1st of May to the 31st of July, both inclusive, the fur seals on the high sea in the part of the Pacific Ocean, inclusive of the Bering Sea, which is situated to the north of the 35th degree of north latitude and eastward of the 180th degree of longitude from Greenwich till it strikes the water boundary described in article i. of the treaty of 1867 between the United States and Russia, and following that line up to Bering Straits. The remaining articles provide that only sailing vessels shall be em-

ployed in the fur-seal fishery, that nets, firearms, and explosives shall not be used in said fishery, that these regulations shall remain in force until abolished or modified in whole or in part by common agreement between the Governments of the United States and Great Britain, and that the regulations "shall be submitted every five years to a new examination, so as to enable both interested governments to consider whether in the light of past experience there is occasion for any modification thereof." These are the only provisions of any importance, and the only ones of which we need to take account in the present controversy. There is no provision requiring any patrol whatever. If any subsequent agreement has been made between the two governments in reference to a patrol, it evidently did not specify any particular number of vessels, since no such number is mentioned in Mr. Sherman's alleged dispatch. Yet that despatch conveys to the mind of the uninstructed reader the idea that Great Britain has violated her duty in this behalf—not what we consider to be her duty, but a duty expressed and defined in the award; which is false.

If the announcement by the *Tribune's* Washington correspondent a fortnight ago that the President intended to make wholesale modifications in the civil-service rules was put out as a "feeler," it has not taken long to show that the country would not condone such a repudiation of the most binding personal and party pledges. The *Tribune* itself upon reflection has become convinced that the step proposed would be a dreadful blunder. In an excellent article on Wednesday week it exposed the humbug of the spoilsmen's talk about Cleveland's "midnight order," pointing out that it was issued on the 6th of May, 1896, "and met with the general commendation of the press of both parties, including the *Tribune*"; showed that even if the charges of partisanship in the Government Printing-Office are true, they constitute no argument for abolishing the competitive system, since "the power to dismiss men and fill their places by impartial examination—thus at once rebuking favoritism and vindicating the merit system—may give a satisfactory solution of the difficulty"; justified the present inclusion of chiefs of division in the classified service; and concluded with the declaration that "the extension of the merit system is a Republican policy, and spoilsmen might as well reconcile themselves to the fact." This is the right sort of talk, and will show Mr. McKinley how utterly inexcusable and indefensible would be the surrender to the spoilsmen which

he was reported to be on the point of making.

"Labor" has been insisting that it was high time it got some "recognition" from the Administration, and on Saturday Mr. McKinley tendered it the nomination of the notorious Powderly as Commissioner of Immigration. But "Labor" is more indignant with the President now than before he had done anything for it. The Central Labor Union, at its meeting on Sunday, adopted a resolution declaring that the nomination of Powderly "is the greatest official insult ever offered by the federal Government to organized labor." The President of the American Federation of Labor explains the opposition by saying that "Powderly is not a man who is in touch with the labor organizations of this country, or who can be trusted in a position of such responsibility." But neither does his nomination command the endorsement of people outside the ranks of these organizations, since everybody knows that he would never have been thought of as Commissioner of Immigration except for his claims as a representative of "Labor."

The new Librarian of Congress has at least shown that he knows the absolute need of expert knowledge in his chief subordinates, even if the President was willing to overlook that requirement in his own appointment to the head of the Library. Mr. Young evidently perceives that there are positions into which the ordinary politician's man could not be put without bringing disaster to the whole institution. His choice of Mr. Hutcheson to be in charge of the reading-room was made strictly on the standard of merit, and so was his appointment of Mr. Solberg, announced on Monday, to be Register of Copyrights. This official has varied duties to perform requiring technical skill and executive capacity beyond the ordinary; and Mr. Solberg's training and studies and writings prove him to be a master of the intricacies of copyright law. He will, as Register of Copyrights, have to answer all communications relating to the subject (now numbering, it is said, about 140 letters each day); to record, index, and classify all copyrights granted; to receive, receipt for, and deposit all moneys transmitted for copyright (upwards of \$50,000 annually); to prepare the weekly catalogue of title-entries of copyrighted articles; to take charge of copyright business with citizens of foreign countries; with many other kindred matters. The unusual attainments obviously needed for the proper discharge of all these duties are possessed by Mr. Solberg in so eminent a degree as to make his appointment ideal. It must be set down greatly to the credit of Librarian Young.

The platform adopted by the National League of Republican Clubs, a notorious organization of office-seekers, contains an extraordinary assortment of absurd and mischievous propositions. Most political platforms contain some suggestions of statesmanship, some recognitions of the existence of rational principles of legislation, some endorsements of established rules of political wisdom. These asseverations may be perfunctory, but they at least throw a mantle of decorum over the low and selfish purposes of politicians. But the platform of this League contains nothing to which the epithet statesmanlike could be applied without doing violence to language. It would be regarded as a discreditable production by any backwoods debating society, and in its complete omission of everything rational and inclusion of all that is dangerous, it is perhaps unsurpassed. The mere enumeration of its "planks" is enough to discredit it with all unbiased citizens. As to the achievements of President McKinley and a Republican Congress, they enumerate two, and two only, and these they praise without stint—the sending a Monetary Commission abroad to keep up the agitation for bimetallism, and the presentation of a scheme for seizing the Sandwich Islands. For the future, they propose intervention in Cuba, discriminating duties on freight brought here in vessels of foreign ownership, a bounty on beet-sugar, woman suffrage, "modification of the civil-service law," and the exclusion of "unworthy" immigrants. We venture to suggest to intelligent Republicans that they should compare this programme with that adopted at the same time in Kentucky by the National Democrats. It will be an exercise that may involve some humiliation of spirit, but the results cannot fail to be salutary.

The resolutions adopted by the bankers of New York State at their annual convention in Saratoga on Friday have the true ring. They do not mince matters or deal in roundabout phrases. They recommend the retirement of all Government paper and the substitution of a safe bank currency under Governmental control. The time has gone by when there was anything to be gained by the policy of silence or of half-measures on the part of the banks. At this time, when the politicians at Washington are eating their own words and shrinking from any reform whatever, firmness of tone is more than ever necessary on the part of those who understand the dangers of the present currency system. The New York bankers know that the policy of timidity never makes friends or accomplishes any good in this world. Hence they have spoken the truth with clearness and emphasis. For so doing they are entitled to the thanks of all intelligent men, whether Congress agrees with them or not.

The report of the Bureau of Statistics on the export and import trade of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, makes in many respects the most remarkable showing in our history. The country's merchandise exports during the past twelve months have outrun all precedent. They cross the billion-dollar mark for the first time since 1891, and exceed the total even of that year by \$21,708,943. The year's enormous total of exported merchandise, \$1,051,987,091, passes no less than \$169,380,153 beyond the total in the fiscal year 1896. Simultaneously the country's import trade has decreased \$15,350,769 from 1896, and falls \$102,000,000 below the total of 1893, the maximum in our history. As a result, the excess of exports over imports rises this year to \$287,613,186; a balance twenty-three millions greater than the highest previous record—that of 1879—and nearly eighty-five millions in excess of 1892, a year comprising the enormous cereal exports after the foreign harvest failure. But for the abnormally heavy import movement since last March, forced by the threat of increased customs duties, the balance in our favor would be very much greater. Had imports during March and the three ensuing months continued, as they usually do under normal circumstances, in a volume no greater than the February import movement, the total export balance for the fiscal year would have exceeded \$394,000,000.

It is hardly necessary to add that exporters were greatly helped by the tariff act of 1894, which, with all its imperfections, gave raw materials on advantageous terms to some of our most important industries. How widely the extension of export in manufactures has gone this year may be judged from the fact that up to the close of May (the detailed report for that month is just at hand) exports of machinery increased \$7,073,000 over 1896, or 36 per cent.; exports of copper \$10,962,000, or 67 per cent.; exports of bicycles \$4,740,115, or 340 per cent.; exports of cotton-seed oil \$2,559,000, or 50 per cent.; exports of wood and wooden goods \$6,299,000, or 21 per cent., and exports of cotton cloths \$4,923,000, or 10 per cent. The clever search for markets is illustrated by the fact that export of cottons to China and the other Asiatic states ran up \$4,975,000 over the year preceding, and that shipments of bicycles to Great Britain itself rose from \$324,312 in 1896 to \$2,082,963 in the same eleven months of 1893. On the other hand it is evident that consumers in the United States have faced the problem of hard times with courage and honesty, and have cut down heavily on luxuries. Such shrinkage, during the eleven months ending May 31, as the \$3,487,000 decrease in imports of jewelry, the decline of \$8,-

791,000 in raw silk imports, and of \$3,266,000 in imports of manufactured silk, with the fall of nearly a million dollars even in import of foreign-made gloves, is conclusive on this point.

The Supreme Court of Kansas has just come to the rescue of the people from the serious trouble threatened by careless law-making in that ill-ruled State. The last Populist Legislature passed a bill which was designed to repeal many redundant, obsolete, and inoperative provisions, about 300 pages of which had accumulated on the statute-book. After the session had closed, the discovery was made that, if the new law should stand, it would abolish half-a-dozen judicial districts, embracing many of the most populous counties in the State, and involve the courts in great confusion. The matter was carried to the Supreme Court, and that tribunal was fortunately able to set the law aside as plainly unconstitutional, since it contained a multiplicity of subjects which were not expressed in the title, whereas the Constitution expressly provides that a bill shall contain only one subject, which must be so expressed. An amusing feature of this decision annulling the action of a Populist Legislature is the fact that it was rendered by the new Populist Chief Justice, who has earnestly protested against the encroachments of courts and their tendency to defeat the will of Legislatures by a resort to technicalities.

The attention of Mr. Bryan and ex-Gov. Altgeld should be called to an extraordinary revelation of the enormities of the "money power" which has recently been made in England. A select parliamentary committee appointed to inquire into the practices of money-lenders had before it Isaac Gordon, a native of Russia and still a Russian subject, but who has resided in England for some fifteen years. This enterprising person-carried on business in several different places and under eight different names, his reason, as he frankly stated, being that if he traded under the same name everywhere, his customers "would not be likely to enter the trap again." The plan seems to have worked very well in some ways, as one unfortunate dressmaker borrowed from Gordon three times, supposing that she was dealing with three different money-lenders; but as she eventually became bankrupt, the profits of the transaction were not as large as the rate of interest would indicate. Another customer borrowed £395, and, after repaying £445, became bankrupt, being still indebted in the amount of £362, of which Gordon succeeded in recovering more than three-fourths. The witness displaying some signs of pleasure in relating this transaction, the chairman

severely observed that he seemed to be delighted at his customers' bankruptcy, to which the witness cheerfully replied: "Oh dear, no. It is only a matter of business."

Mr. Gordon testified further that he exercised much discrimination in selecting loans. Clergymen he had dropped; "they were an awful lot." Young officers and undergraduates he would none of; nor did he condescend to the "ignorant, common class," or have dealings with members of Parliament. Women owning annuities and tradesmen were his favorites, and he had sometimes made loans to persons of this class at 3,000 per cent. Security Mr. Gordon never demanded, for the excellent reason that when people had securities they knew better than to come to him. He expressed a willingness to comply with the law if it limited the rate of interest, provided he found business still profitable; but was strongly opposed to having the courts review his transactions. As he admitted that he had been imprisoned for "fraud, or misrepresentation, or something of the sort," his aversion to courts need not excite surprise. It was shared by another witness, Mr. Isaac Samuel (doing business under the name "Fielding's, Limited"), who disapproved of the propensity of judges to calculate interest by the year. If he lent £5 on condition of being repaid £6 5s. in a week, his profit would be 25 per cent., but the courts would call it 1,000 per cent. per annum. This practice tended to create a prejudice against money-lenders, some of whom the witness admitted were beggarly people, who had no money of their own to lend, and charged a commission for introducing borrowers to substantial concerns like his own. Dickens has sometimes been accused of exaggeration, but he left no description of the extortions of usurers that equals the evidence presented before this parliamentary committee. It is probable that a recommendation will be made that professional money-lenders shall take out licenses and give bonds for good behavior.

Some weeks ago the House of Commons, in a moment of hilarity, passed on first reading a bill to extend the suffrage to women. But it fought shy of so much as taking it up on second reading; in fact, showed a disposition to burke the measure altogether. This male cowardice brought out at last the following petition, signed by a number of ladies, and presented in the House on July 6:

"That your petitioners view with indignation and alarm the existing procedure of the House of Commons, which reduces legislation to a mere game of chance, and permits the repeated and insulting postponement of the consideration and satisfaction of the just claims of women to citizen-

ship. Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that your honorable House will so reform your procedure as to secure in the future fair consideration of public questions with some regard to their relative importance, and will on Wednesday, July 7, affirm the right of women to citizenship by passing through the stages of committee and of third reading the parliamentary franchise (extension to women) bill."

An old member rose to ask if a "petition couched in language of this sort ought to be received by the House." The Speaker said it was for the House to say. Then somebody else inquired whether the honorable member who presented the petition was not answerable for its language. Speaker Gully said that honorable members presenting petitions must exercise their own discretion in doing so; and added impressively: "The right honorable gentleman has in this case exercised his own discretion." The bill was withdrawn.

The fate of Greece is discussed in the *Contemporary Review* by Mr. E. J. Dillon in a long and, on the whole, instructive and suggestive article. The truth is that the Government of Greece, like that of the United States, is in such a condition as to make the annexation of outside territory inexpedient. The internal problems are so serious as to demand the employment of all the available political virtue for their solution. But a few years ago the interest on the public debt was "scaled down," while at the same time extravagance prevailed in every department of the Government. The "spoils system" flourishes luxuriantly, and the number of office-holders is frightfully large. The entire adult male population of Greece is about 500,000, and over 17,000 of these are Government functionaries. The army numbers at the highest estimate 80,000 men, but the civilians employed in the War Office are nearly 5,000. The Department of Finance has over 2,700 functionaries; that of the Interior has nearly 4,700. Under such an incubus of public servants taxes have been doubled within a few years, in spite of the repudiation of the debt. As Mr. Dillon points out, the Greeks can hardly be regarded as inferior to the Rumanians; but the Rumanians have succeeded in maintaining a respectable government and in securing material prosperity. It is a deplorable thing that Greece should become tributary to Turkey, as is proposed by the Powers, for no more taxes can be wrung from the people without oppression. But it is clear that the amount of the tribute could be raised without increasing the taxes simply by reforming the Government, and if the exaction of the tribute should have that result, it might eventually be for the advantage of the Greeks. If they will learn to govern themselves, they will have opportunities enough for expansion in the future.

### "DIGNIFIED" DIPLOMACY.

The Republican platform called for a foreign policy which, while "firm" and "vigorous," should also be "dignified." Reduced to practice in its four months of being in power, the party's theory of dignified diplomacy seems to be a mixture of deceit and slang-whanging. Secretary Sherman's two exploits up to date are his deception of the Japanese Minister in the Hawaiian affair; and his hectoring letter to Lord Salisbury about the sealing regulations, which an English newspaper characterizes as "an explosion of bad manners," and goes not wide of the mark. Mr. Sherman's method of presenting his case is itself irritating because it imputes bad faith to the British authorities. Thus he says, near the beginning of the despatch:

"It is not pleasant to have to state that the impartial character which it has been the custom to attribute to the reports of naturalists of high standing, has been greatly impaired by the apparent subjection of this report to the political exigencies of the situation. It is further to be regretted that the report was so long delayed that no opportunity was afforded this Government to examine it before the definite and final rejection of the President's proposals, based mainly upon its conclusions, was communicated to me. This conduct recalls the incident which preceded the arbitration at Paris, and which came near rendering that arbitration abortive, when a similar report of a British commission was withheld until after the case of each Government was exchanged and the report of the American commission made public."

"Political exigencies of the situation" is a phrase imputing bad faith. It is a locution not used in diplomacy, except where one party wishes to make the continuance of the correspondence difficult. If Lord Salisbury had used it, it would have been considered impertinent and insulting. If it is not so considered on the other side, it must be because they think that the Americans are not used to refined manners and do not recognize the force of words. After beginning his discourse in this offensive way, Mr. Sherman concludes by saying:

"We have felt assured that, as it has been demonstrated that the practice of pelagic sealing, if continued, will not only bring itself to an end, but will work the destruction of a great interest of a friendly nation, her Majesty's Government would desist from an act so suicidal and so unneighborly, and which certainly could not command the approval of its own people."

Here we have it again. Not only is the kind of sealing authorized and fixed by the Paris tribunal "suicidal" and "unneighborly," but it "could not command the approval of its own [the British] people." In other words, we know better than Lord Salisbury does what the British people approve of. No wonder that such language results in a polite refusal to reopen the question at this time.

There are some most curious circumstances attending the publication of the document. If it was an explosion, it was an unexpected explosion, and the

question is, Who fired the mine? Some weeks ago there was much Jingo chuckling over a forthcoming seals correspondence. It was hinted that Mr. Sherman had written a peppery letter of which the Administration was very proud, and it was said that the whole thing would soon be laid before Congress to show what a "sassing" Salisbury had got. But suddenly there was a cooling down at the State Department. Mr. Sherman had not been so merciless to poor Salisbury, after all. Anyhow, the correspondence would not be given out just yet. You see, there was a very delicate bimetallic negotiation going on in England, and she might not be willing both to change her standard of value and to submit to a public slapping of her face. Besides, Special Agent J. W. Foster was still negotiating about the seals, and he had a notion, foolish but traditional, that to call a man a scoundrel was not the best way to win him over to your way of thinking. Oh no, no inflammatory correspondence would be given out, and President McKinley had a message all written informing Congress that it was "not compatible with the public interest" that the correspondence should be laid before it.

At this interesting juncture, off went the "exclusive" bomb in the very *Court Journal*—we would say the *Tribune*. There was Sherman's letter in all its senile fury—*Sir Anthony Absolute* bursting into diplomacy. Everybody was set guessing how the *Tribune* got it. All the world wondered, too, how the *Tribune* could think the publication of a document which McKinley wanted suppressed a good way to back its friends. The conviction that Mr. McKinley is absolutely wise, great, and good is, we know, firmly entrenched in the *Tribune* office—at least it was until Platt ran off with all the spoils. How could it be wise to give to the public what Mr. McKinley thought it unwise to give? There is a mystery here—perhaps several mysteries.

One ingenious theory is that the Envoys-editor's getting his luncheon every day at Windsor Castle had something to do with the case. Naturally Lord Salisbury would appeal to him for help. The British Premier must, of course, have read the *Tribune's* rebuke of Mr. Foster for being "needlessly aggressive" in his statement of the sealing difficulty, and what more likely than that he should want the *Tribune* to rebuke Secretary Sherman also? Surely a paper edited by so polite a diplomat and such a great favorite with the Queen would expose and resent such boorish manners. In this way, some able reasoners maintain, Secretary Sherman's letter found its way "exclusively" to the columns of the *Tribune*. We hesitate to pronounce judgment on this theory. Unaccustomed as we are to royal circles and the subtle methods of editor-

diplomats, we can only record the theory, express our simple-minded wonder, and pass on.

Another theory is that Mr. Sherman himself gave out the letter. He is still fond—perhaps fonder than ever—of seeing himself in print. It would be well, too, to put an end to the unpleasant rumors that his powers were failing. Just read that letter! Could a man in the prime of life be more insulting? Besides, the occasion called for something vigorous. It had just been announced in London that the British Government had declined to reopen the sealing question until the *modus vivendi* should expire in 1898. Declined, have they? Well, at least the country ought to know that the Secretary made faces and shook his fists at Salisbury. Whatever the President might think of what was or was not compatible with the public interest, the main thing was to let the people know that there is life in the old man yet.

A more commonplace and, we regret to say, more likely view is that the *Tribune* was simply carried away by the temptation to score a "scoop." Confronted with a "scoop," the most diplomatic and statesmanlike editor in the world trembles and yields. It may be bad policy; it may offend the President, before whom it is the paper's duty to grovel; it may embarrass the party and make its diplomacy ludicrous rather than dignified; but a "scoop" is so glorious that policy, President, and party have to take second place. This must be the *Tribune's* excuse. It will be sufficient in the newspaper world, but we fear that in the political world it will hardly pass. The many "original McKinley men" on the *Tribune* must sadly think so as they see Platt bagging office after office which they had intended for themselves.

### THE LOUISVILLE CONVENTION.

The convention of the National (sound-money) Democrats held at Louisville on July 14 was a success far exceeding the hopes of its promoters. It was in that respect akin to the turn-out of the same party in the recent election in the State of Michigan. In the latter it will be recalled that a few men on the State committee, contrary to the advice of the party leaders, decided to make a separate nomination for Judge of the Supreme Court, merely to keep up the appearance of an organization. To the great surprise of those who had opposed this policy, and of themselves as well, their ticket received nearly 35,000 votes, against less than 7,000 cast for Palmer and Buckner in the Presidential election. This fact proved that at least 28,000 Sound-Money Democrats in Michigan had voted for McKinley. This number taken from Bryan and given to the Republicans was just sufficient to account for the 56,000 majority by

which the latter carried the State. The probability is, however, that a much larger number of Sound-Money Democrats voted for McKinley in the fall of 1896 than voted for their own ticket in the spring of 1897, as the latter election did not attract general interest.

The Louisville convention was remarkable for the number and spirit of those attending it, but no one should have been surprised by the strength and national reputation of those who took the leading part in it. It was well known beforehand that Mr. Carlisle, Mr. Watterson, and Mr. Breckinridge were unswerving supporters of the movement, and that they would never yield an inch to the demands of the silverites. It was not known that the masses who went with them last year were equally firm. The usual result of a party split is a compromise and a coming together of the broken parts. It is much easier to "make friends" after the bitterness of the strife is past, after personal animosities are healed, and after the fact has become clear that offices are not to be gained by fighting each other. Consequently there is always a drift toward peace and harmony after an internal contest which has resulted in defeat. Many predictions had been made that peace and harmony would be found in Kentucky this year. The chances of such a result were greater there than in Michigan because the Kentucky Democrats really forfeited State control and the local offices by their division. United, they were the majority party, whereas the Michigan Democrats were the minority party and had nothing to lose in any case.

When we contemplate the powerful reasons making for "harmony" in Kentucky, we are all the more impressed with the noble devotion to principle which inspires the National Democrats of that State and holds them true to their convictions. At this juncture, when the Republicans are doing everything possible to alienate their Democratic supporters of last year by tariff legislation little short of infamous, such devotion is all but heroic. We express our own admiration for it, and we draw new hope from the promise which these men bring, of the ultimate downfall of both free silver and the robber tariff. Mr. Carlisle is right in saying that those two heresies go together. The Bryanites in both House and Senate have, with a few honorable exceptions, concurred with the Republicans in passing the Dingley bill. That is, they have opposed it in such a way as to secure its passage, and some of them have even voted for it outright. Evidently such men are not to be relied on for any share in the battle royal which is still to be fought in order to emancipate the people from the slavery of protection.

Mr. Carlisle usually makes the best speech of any occasion in which he par-

ticipates. It was so at Louisville. He said that there was not a genuine Democratic sentiment in the Chicago platform, and that no Democrat was bound by it, no matter how many State or national conventions endorsed it.

"You are here to-day," he continued, "to repudiate it absolutely and unqualifiedly, and to reassert the true doctrines of the party with all these modern heresies eliminated. The paralysis of trade and industry, resulting in the loss of public revenue and in destroying the ability of the people to meet their private obligations, was produced mainly by unwise currency and fiscal legislation, and the return of prosperity has so far been prevented by continued partisan agitation in favor of still more radical and destructive measures on the same subjects. The whole field of domestic industry and enterprise, every calling and occupation in which an intelligent and progressive people can possibly engage, has been subjected to the most searching investigation by trained experts, stimulated by selfish personal interest, to discover useful articles of consumption upon which new or additional burdens could be so imposed by law as to rob the people of their honest earnings, without raising revenue for the Government."

Mr. Watterson said that, "as a political issue, the free and independent coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 was as dead as African slavery." The splendid rally of the Sound-Money Democrats at Louisville certainly goes far to confirm this belief, for it is only necessary to convince the local politicians in Kentucky and everywhere else that the offices do not lie that way in order to kill it. Let them once understand that the National Democrats intend to stand for their principles, now and for ever, and that their votes are necessary to Democratic success, and the Bryanites will drop free coinage and come back to the principles of Jefferson, Jackson, and Tilden. The Louisville convention is fresh proof of the steadfastness of those who supported Palmer and Buckner last year. It will notably confirm the faith of their friends in other States, and in other cities, too. It will not fail to have its influence in our coming municipal campaign. It has already had its influence in Massachusetts. It will find its echo in every Northern and Western State where an election is to take place this fall. Nothing more hopeful has been seen in the political field during the present year.

#### THE MINERS' STRIKE AND THE LAW.

The struggle of the coal-miners to secure higher wages naturally arouses the sympathy of benevolent people. It does not appear to admit of question that the wages which these miners have lately received are insufficient for their comfortable support. The prices at which bituminous coal has been sold this year have been such as to render it impossible for capitalists to make a profit out of the business if they paid the miners "living" wages, and it is doubtful if any profits have been made even with the low wages actually paid. This unsatis-

factory situation has been brought about by the desperate struggle for business of several insolvent concerns. These concerns have reduced prices below the cost of production, and their solvent competitors have had to lower their prices in order not to lose their own trade altogether. Under these circumstances it seems quite reasonable that the miners should try to make an agreement with their employers to restore prices and wages to normal figures. Were such a restoration accomplished, the beneficial results would be very extensive, and the consumers of coal could not complain of an advance in price sufficient to afford a reasonable compensation to those engaged in its production.

Yet it does not seem to have occurred to the newspaper writers who are now trying to gush with sympathetic zeal for the miners' cause, that the aims of the miners are altogether unlawful. That very anti-monopoly legislation which these same writers have done their best to promote, stands squarely across the path of coal-miners as well as of other persons who think of entering into any agreement to fix the price of labor or of any commodity. It was but a few months ago that the Supreme Court of the United States decided that an agreement among railroad managers "for the purpose of mutual protection by establishing and maintaining reasonable rates" was an illegal agreement. It is not material that the agreement in that case related to freight charges, while the agreement which the miners are struggling to reach relates to coal. The principle is the same, and while there was much doubt concerning the applicability of the anti-monopoly law to railroads, there can be little question that it applies to such a commodity as coal when it becomes an article of interstate commerce, especially since many railroad corporations are engaged in coal-mining.

As Judge Peckham pointed out, the coal-miners cannot be heard to maintain that their struggle is not for the purpose of restraining trade, or for establishing rates above what is reasonable. It would make no difference if they demonstrated that the result of the agreement which they desire would be not only to increase their own comfort, but also to increase trade. Whether the rates of wages which they propose are reasonable or not is quite immaterial. It is the law of the land that any agreement to maintain rates is prohibited by act of Congress, and whatever inconvenience the miners now have to bear is not to be removed by any agreements of theirs. True, the miners might, perhaps, lawfully contract with their employers to accept lower wages than at present. Even the Supreme Court would hardly, unless it should change its mind, hold that such an agreement was in re-

straint of trade, as involving the maintenance of rates. Under some circumstances employers might be pleased to learn that such an agreement was legal, but they would hardly desire it now, and the miners are too near starvation to listen patiently to such an elucidation of their legal rights. They have been assured that the courts were against them, and that the judges were bribed by their employers. When they find it literally true that the Supreme Court has declared illegal all agreements that they may make with their employers for maintaining the price of coal and the wages for mining it, they may reasonably conclude that there is no falsehood in the stories of the venality and hostility of the judiciary.

Some claim may be made that the law still tolerates agreements between the individual workman and the individual master to maintain a fixed rate of wages. It may be urged that wages and prices are different things; that the law is intended to regulate the compensation of capitalists, not that of laborers. An examination of Judge Peckham's reasoning will show that this view cannot be maintained. It may be thought reasonable, but he shows that reason is not to be considered in the construction of an act of Congress. There is no escape from the sweeping rule that, any agreement to maintain rates, reasonable or unreasonable, is in restraint of trade, and, therefore, illegal, whether it is made by railroads or grocers or coal-miners.

Were agreements concerning wages excepted, it would make no practical difference. It would be idle for the miners to demand higher wages if the price of coal is not to be advanced. Miners' wages are generally regulated by a "sliding scale"; they vary as the price of coal varies. Nor do the miners desire individual agreements with individual masters. They want rates which combinations of masters shall agree with combinations of workmen to maintain. Such rates, however, the masters can evidently not agree to pay, unless there is some agreement concerning the price at which coal is to be sold. A man might be very quickly ruined if he agreed to pay a specified rate of wages without reference to this price. He might find that it cost him more to mine a ton of coal than he could get for it, and his workmen would soon find that their wages not only were not maintained, but were extinguished altogether.

We are very much afraid that the Governors of the coal-producing States have participated in a conspiracy to encourage acts in restraint of trade. They have been proposing arbitration, with a view of establishing agreements of an unlawful character between the miners and their employers. They cannot plead ignorance of the law, as the miners may, and it becomes them to be ex-

tremely circumspect in their recommendations. They must take care to suggest nothing that can be construed as tending to maintain reasonable or stable rates for coal or for coal-mining, for that is a crime. We do not know what counsel the Governors can lawfully give in the present emergency, and can only suggest that a conference of anti-monopoly newspaper writers and legislators should be called to devise expedients for raising miners' wages and decreasing the cost of producing coal at one and the same time. These people have passed laws that leave the miners in a bad legal scrape, and they ought to point the way out of it.

#### NO ENTANGLING ALLIANCES.

Some of our readers will recall an amusing satire that appeared during Mr. Greeley's Presidential campaign, in which the country was represented as having been conquered by foreign Powers exasperated to hostility by our disregard of diplomatic customs. As Mr. Greeley was not elected, the prophecy was not fulfilled; yet the course of events recently has been such as to make our foreign relations a subject of some anxiety. Were Washington to return to life, he would certainly be reassured concerning one danger, and would admit that his warning against "entangling alliances" had been heeded. With the exception of Venezuela, of whose claims we have somewhat accidentally found ourselves the champions, it may fairly be said that we stand without an ally on either continent. None of the Powers has any reason to regard us with a particularly friendly feeling, and several of them have good reasons for cherishing sentiments of hostility. If such isolation is desirable, we may congratulate ourselves on the success of our diplomats in attaining it.

As to France, the Power with which we have, as our earliest ally, always maintained friendly relations, the evidences of her present irritation are manifest. She has already imposed retaliatory duties on our products, and is only waiting for the passage of the new tariff act to adopt severer measures. Mr. Depew would hardly be called as a witness by those who disapprove of the policy of the Republican party, but he voluntarily testifies concerning an incident which he properly describes as remarkable. At a dinner in Paris which he attended, and at which one of the French Ministers was present, our Ambassador referred to the traditional friendship between France and the United States. "The French Minister, replying, said in substance: 'Yes, we have traditional friendship, and desire to maintain it. But friendship between nations is not sentiment, but acts. If your new tariff excludes our goods from your markets and injures our trade, then you

are unfriendly and hostile.' It was a singularly blunt speech for a Frenchman, and plainly said: 'Fine words butter no parsnips for us.'"

The utterances of the German Emperor are not intrinsically of the weightiest character, but his position gives them importance, and when he talks of "the American peril," we need not blink the fact that this means hostility. Back of the Emperor stands a strong party, increasingly aggressive, and as "quick to resent insults" as the chaplain of our House of Representatives prayed that we might be. This party will presently show us that if we propose to discriminate against German beet-sugar, we shall not have the game to ourselves. Nor will the German Government be propitiated by Mr. McKinley's nomination as consul at important German cities of men who were formerly German subjects. We have a right to appoint whom we please, but this practice has always produced irritation in the past and is sure to arouse resentment in the future. Four of these German-Americans were recently appointed to German posts in one day, and the posts filled are among the most important in the German empire. This is not the way to promote friendly relations with any country, least of all just now with Germany.

The English are doubtless the last people in the world to wish to quarrel with us. They have manifested for many years a very friendly disposition, and have pursued a conciliatory policy under circumstances of extreme provocation. Until recently they supposed that these friendly sentiments were reciprocated, but the Venezuelan episode undeceived them. They learned that, while they had friends in this country, the number of Americans who had been taught to hate them was startlingly great, and that, as Rufus Choate said at the time of the *Caroline* controversy, the thunder of cannon in a war with England was music to which this nation had no great objection to wake up. There can be no genuine friendship under such conditions as these, and when our underbred amateur diplomats attribute the conduct of blackguards to the representatives of the British Government, we need not suppose that a gentlemanly forbearance is any indication of an affectionate approval of our methods. We occasionally see people enduring much indignity in their efforts to quiet a tipsy acquaintance, but true friendship is not promoted in this way.

The "singularly blunt speech" of the French Minister, which Mr. Depew thought so significant, was a repetition of the complaints of the deputation from the South American states recently entertained by our merchants. These visitors acknowledged the courtesy of their hosts and the magnificent possibilities of commerce exhibited by our country, but

they frankly declared that, if the proposals of our tariff-framers were to be enacted, they should return home and advise immediate measures of retaliation. Nor is the spirit that we have stirred up in our neighbors on the north less unfriendly than that aroused in the South American states. The Dominion of Canada has promptly made arrangements to respond to our tariff by duties of its own, and to establish with England that reciprocity in commerce which we have labored to extinguish. The wisdom of this latter step is so obvious that we may expect the relations between the Dominion and the mother country to become increasingly close, while we shall become more and more estranged from both of them.

A few years ago nothing would have seemed more absurd than an alliance between Spain and Japan. That there should be any harmony between the most effete of European Powers and the most progressive of those of the Orient seems incredible; and yet we have behaved in such a way towards both of them as to make their alliance a matter for serious discussion. Our Congressmen have had capital sport with Spain; they have thought her so feeble that we could insult her with impunity, thereby winning much fame for themselves. Not all of them would threaten Japan with so light a heart; that Power recently displayed a combination of pugnacity and vigor that was rather startling. Nevertheless we have taken a step in negotiating the treaty with Hawaii the meaning of which the Japanese understand perfectly well. They are sufficiently astute to know that "friendship between nations is not sentiment, but acts"; and while they are wise enough to keep their own counsel, it is not difficult to imagine what that counsel is.

We are still fortunately at peace with all the world, but, as Senator Hale observed in urging the prompt completion of some more naval vessels, "foreign complications are pressing upon us." These complications are not alliances—north, south, east, and west we may look in vain for a Power, civilized or uncivilized, whom our policy has not tended to alienate and irritate. Some day our statesmen may carry their offensive behavior a little too far, and we may then find ourselves in difficulties which will be witnessed with satisfaction by all the peoples of the earth.

#### MR. CHAMBERLAIN AND THE RAID.

Mr. Joseph Chamberlain has often been said to be the most American among English public men. He is aggressive, showy, "smart," absorbed in politics as a game. These qualities have sometimes led to his being compared to Mr. Blaine. Another parallel between the two may now be drawn in the conspiracy of which Mr. Chamberlain ap-

pears to be the object. Mulligan letters were maliciously used against Mr. Blaine, and Transvaal telegrams are so used against Mr. Chamberlain. The telegrams have been just as fully "explained" as were the famous letters, and yet there are wicked people who say that the Colonial Secretary's innocence of all connection with the Jameson raid has not been shown. Mr. Labouchere has his suspicions, as revealed in his minority report, in which he says that the Parliamentary committee should have probed more deeply into the evidence implicating Mr. Chamberlain.

What is that evidence? Well, it consists partly in the firm conviction of some of the leading conspirators that Mr. Chamberlain knew all about their plans and approved them. Dr. Harris, Rhodes's agent, thought he had clearly given the Secretary to understand the scheme; he swore so, in fact, before the committee, but when Mr. Chamberlain said that he had no recollection whatever of the conversation which Dr. Harris said had taken place between them, the latter said that he was not the man to set his memory against the Secretary's. He was positive, however, that he had "spoken openly" to Under-Secretary Fairfield, Chamberlain's head man; but then, as Mr. Chamberlain astutely pointed out, Mr. Fairfield was very deaf and might not have heard what he said to him, and besides he was now dead, and it was hardly fitting to involve the character of the dead. Dr. Jameson and the English officers who went with him on the raid all thought that Mr. Chamberlain was conniving at their action. Most significant of all, Cecil Rhodes himself was positive that Chamberlain knew his plans and was supporting them.

The proof that Rhodes thought so is various. One item of it is given as follows in the *July Contemporary Review*:

"A Conservative of the highest honor and standing, whose word no one would dream of disputing, was travelling in the Cape and saw Mr. Rhodes. They discussed the matter freely, and Mr. Rhodes told him plainly that Chamberlain was in it up to the hilt. On that authority, the member saw Lord Salisbury, and was ultimately confronted with the Colonial Secretary. 'Who told you I was in it?' said the Minister. 'Rhodes himself,' said the critic. We omit the reply."

The reply was, according to the story current in the House of Commons, "The traitor!" Other evidence of the highest significance is contained in the telegrams sent to and by Rhodes. Here are two of them:

FLORA SHAW TO RHODES.

"17th December, 1895.

"Held an interview with Secretary Transvaal. Left here on Saturday for Hague, Berlin, Paris; fear in negotiation with these parties. Chamberlain sound in case of interference European Powers, but have special reason to believe wishes you must do it immediately."

RHODES TO FLORA SHAW.

"30th December, 1895.

"Inform Chamberlain that I shall get

through all right if he supports me, but he must not send cable like he sent to High Commissioner in South Africa. To-day the crux is, I will win and South Africa will belong to England."

Certainly no man could have sent that telegram who was not sure that Chamberlain was "in it up to the hilt." What must have been his surprise, then, when the Secretary declared in the House of Commons, within two months' time:

"It is asked of me, 'Was the High Commissioner, were other people, ignorant of this projected invasion?' I say, to the best of my knowledge and belief, that everybody, that Mr. Rhodes, that the Chartered Company, that the reform committee of Johannesburg, and the High Commissioner were all equally ignorant of the intention or action of Dr. Jameson. That is the belief which I express to the House after having carefully examined all the statements of all the parties concerned."

That was before the ugly telegrams had been "decoded" and put in evidence. It was also before the following letter, written just nine days previous to Mr. Chamberlain's assertion of ignorance in the House, was made public:

"COLONIAL OFFICE, Feb. 4, 1896.

"MY DEAR HAWKSLEY: I told Meade of our conversation, and he said we must at once tell Mr. Chamberlain. We did so, and he requests that you will ask your various clients who have sent telegrams about him or the office to send copies to me through you. He does not recollect saying anything anent the insurrection which was supposed to be impending which he would greatly care about if it became public, but he would like to know as a preliminary matter what it is he and we are supposed to have said. Perhaps, also, you could tell us how much of what was sent from here reached the five, or whatever number it was, and, if so, whether it was in substance or in words. Yours truly, E. FAIRFIELD."

Hawksley was Rhodes's solicitor. He replied next day, "Mr. C. knows what I know, and can shape his course with this knowledge."

All this is a cruel network of evidence to be woven about an innocent man. Mr. Chamberlain may escape with his integrity, but what becomes of his reputation for sagacity? Everybody about him knew what was going on, but he was in blissful ignorance. The explanations given by Flora Shaw are too ingenious by half. She was using Mr. Chamberlain's name without authority. The "special reason" she had for thinking he wanted the raid to come off "immediately" was that she heard Mr. Fairfield say so at the Colonial Office—but, then, he might have been chaffing. Did she "inform Chamberlain" in obedience to Rhodes's telegram? Yes, she did, and at once wired back that Chamberlain was "awfully angry." We should think he might have been. But he points to his anger as a proof of his innocence; it was simply outraged virtue indignant. The situation, however, as far as he is concerned, is well summed up in the dispatch of a correspondent who says that the Transvaal inquiry has resulted in clearing Mr. Chamberlain of complicity, but that no foreign Power

will believe it. Foreign Powers are notoriously incredulous.

The lame and impotent conclusion of the committee of inquiry, its running away from every hot trail it struck, can be accounted for, says the writer in the *Contemporary Review*, only on one supposition:

"There is only one reason that can, with any probability be assigned—that is, that some member of the Government has made a 'Front Bench communication' to the leader of the Opposition, indicating to him explicitly that there are 'reasons of state' for stopping the disclosures. There can be little doubt that this is what has happened; and conjecture, not only in this country, but elsewhere, will naturally be keen to know what the nature of this momentous disclosure was."

#### MADAME DE GEOFFRIN.—I.

PARIS, June 29, 1897.

M. Pierre de Ségur has just published, under the somewhat singular title, 'Le Royaume de la Rue Saint-Honoré,' a complete Life of the famous Madame Geoffrin. The Rue Saint-Honoré is but a small kingdom, but, under the sway of Madame Geoffrin, the mother of the Philosophers, as she was sometimes called, it became the intellectual kingdom of the eighteenth century. Not that Madame Geoffrin was herself a great thinker; our modern feminist school would have no right to consider her one of its apostles. She was simply an ambitious and wealthy bourgeoisie, fond of society; and the best society she could have was the society of the Philosophers. She made them comfortable and they made her immortal. During the latter part of her life, her friends pressed her one day to write her memoirs, and, somewhat to their astonishment, she promised to do so. On a given evening all her friends were assembled and she began to read:

"Memoirs of Madame Geoffrin, in six volumes, duodecimo, Preface:

"The truthfulness of my character, the naturalness of my mind, the simplicity and variety of my tastes have rendered me happy in every situation in my life; I take pleasure in recalling its events, and a piquant pleasure in the idea that I am going to reveal myself to myself.

"This work will be for me what are generally, for us women, great projects of needlework or of tapestry: the choice of the design amuses us; the execution occupies us for a short time; we work little, we are soon bored, and we don't end the work."

And there, indeed, the memoirs terminated, nor was there any further question of them. We are, however, very well informed as to Mme. Geoffrin: her name is mentioned in the works of D'Alembert, Morellet, Thomas, Marmontel; her correspondence with the King of Poland, Stanislas August Poniatowski, was published by M. de Moüy; M. de Tornézy published a book on her, under the title, 'Un Bureau d'esprit au 18e siècle.' Goncourt, Sainte-Beuve, and others published valuable articles on the famous bourgeoisie. M. Pierre de Ségur has used a precious collection of inedited documents. Mme. Geoffrin's only daughter, the Marchioness de la Ferté-Imbault, had no direct descendant, but among her heirs, in 1791, was Louis d'Étampes, Marquis of Mauny, the nephew of her husband; and she left him all her own papers as well as the papers of Mme. Geoffrin. M. Pierre de Ségur was allowed by the present head of the family to use the rich

archives of the Étampes; he gives in an appendix the correspondence of the great Catherine with Mme. Geoffrin, and the letters written to her by Grimm from Saint Petersburg during her last malady. M. de Ségur has used also the letters of Mme. Geoffrin to Hume, which are preserved by the Royal Society of Edinburgh.

Mme. Geoffrin was baptized on June 2, 1699, in Paris. Her father, Pierre Rodet, had been a valet de chambre to the Dauphine, and had afterwards bought a small office depending upon the city of Paris. The mother of Mme. Geoffrin was his second wife; she was called Angélique Thérèse Chemineau. Mme. Rodet died after having given birth to two children, a girl and a boy; Rodet himself died in 1706, and the two orphans were educated by their grandmother, Mme. Chemineau, who seems to have been a person of much sense and activity. They lived near Saint-Roch. Diderot represents the child going to church in the early morning "in a flat cornette, a light *siamoise*, pretty as an angel, and joining, before the altar, the prettiest hands in the world." She was only fourteen when she was married to a man of forty-eight, who had fallen in love with her, M. Geoffrin, a modest, quiet man, who was manager and partner in the glass works of Saint-Gobain. Two years after her marriage, on April 20, 1715, Mme. Geoffrin had a daughter, and two years afterwards a son, who died at the age of ten.

The Geoffrins would probably have remained always very obscure if Mme. Geoffrin had not made the acquaintance of the Marquise de Tencin, who was living in her neighborhood, in the Rue Saint-Honoré. Mme. de Tencin had been first a nun at Grenoble; she left her convent and became one of the mistresses of the Regent. She afterwards had a son whom she abandoned, and who became known under the name of D'Alembert; after a life of great agitation, she had finished by opening a salon. How did this great *intrigante* become a friend of an honest and quiet bourgeoisie like Mme. Geoffrin? Mme. de la Ferté-Imbault shall answer: "The Marquise de Tencin knew that my father was honest and rich, that my mother had much esprit, that I was their only daughter; she wished to become acquainted with my mother, so as to marry me to one of her protégés." It must be supposed, also, that the Geoffrins were proud to be admitted to the house of the Marquise. Mme. de Tencin was already old; her habitual guests were Fontenelle, Montesquieu, and other important people. Geoffrin had become very rich, and his wife began to give weekly dinners to her new acquaintances. This revolution was opposed to the simplicity of Geoffrin as well as his love of economy; but Mme. Geoffrin had her will, and her Wednesdays became an institution.

Geoffrin died on December 20, 1749, at the age of eighty-four. A few months after she had become a widow, one of her guests, who had been absent for some time, came to the hôtel in the Rue St.-Honoré. "What has become," he asked of the mistress of the house, "of the old gentleman who always sat at the end of the table, and who never said anything?" "He was my husband," she answered coldly; "he is dead." M. de Ségur repeats this anecdote, which has also been related by Sainte-Beuve, and which has, in fact, become legendary. I cannot help having some doubts about its veracity; but, "se non è vero, è ben trovato."

Madame de Tencin died soon after Geoffrin, and Madame de Geoffrin became, as it were, her heir, and continued to receive her customary guests; they came over to her salon; among the most noted of them were Mairan, Montesquieu, Fontenelle. She added afterwards to this pleiad Marivaux, Marmontel, D'Alembert.

"By a curious phenomenon," says M. de Ségur, "in this chosen assemblage in the midst of a world still new to her, Madame Geoffrin, this *parvenue* who, by her own confession, has received not even an elementary education, who has no tincture of letters, of arts, who has never learned anything excepting in a fugitive way, who does not even know how to spell, moves with perfect ease, is stranger to no subject, inferior to no tasks, provokes, animates, directs the conversation, checks it if necessary, enforces the proper moderation by a word, a gesture, an almost invisible thread. Nobody, it would seem, possessed in a higher degree the gift, peculiar to women, of assimilating naturally and without effort the things of the mind, in the measure in which they can be of use. 'I compare myself,' she said one day to Fontenelle, 'to a round little tree, which has branches on every side. I know a little of everything.'"

Voltaire showed himself several times in the salon of the Rue St.-Honoré, but he never became intimate with Mme. Geoffrin; they soon became hostile. When Voltaire had in his own house representations of "Rome Vaincue," she wrote to a friend, "Voltaire imitates the pastry-cook who eats the cakes which he cannot sell." He often made pleasantries in his letters on "the new Queen of Sheba."

Montesquieu, who was one of the oldest friends of Mme. Geoffrin, and who had learned to appreciate her at Mme. de Tencin's, was offended by a letter which she wrote to him after he had sent her his 'Esprit des Lois.' He imagined that she had written her letter without having taken the pains to read his work. Montesquieu wrote to Mme. de la Ferté-Imbault, who candidly confessed that her mother had made her read to her a few extracts only of the book, during about half an hour. She added that this method, "if it did not do honor to her mother's knowledge, did much honor to her natural esprit." Montesquieu, who was susceptible, and belonged to the "genus irritabile vatum," never forgot this incident.

The man who took and always held the most important place in the salon of Madame Geoffrin was Fontenelle. When she made his acquaintance, he was already seventy-five years old; he was a remnant of the past. He had seen Louis XIV. at the height of his power, having been born in 1657; he died at the age of one hundred, and age never seemed to affect his intellectual powers. "He knows only the mind," Madame Geoffrin said of him. He had an impeccable reason and all the qualities which are compatible with a perfect egotism. "Have you any esteem for me?" Madame Geoffrin one day asked him. "I find you very amiable." "But if somebody told you that I had killed one of my friends, would you believe it?" "I should wait," was the answer. He had the impassibility of a Talleyrand, with none of his vices. Somebody asked him one day: "Monsieur de Fontenelle, did you ever laugh?" "No, I never made ah! ah!" In her 'Nouveaux Mélanges' Madame Necker said of him that "he resembled a delicate machine, which would last for ever, if you put it in a corner, never polished it, or hurt it." Fontenelle's corners were the Academy of Sciences, of which he was Perpetual Secre-

tary, and the salon of Madame Geoffrin. He was a man of great knowledge. His 'Eloges,' his 'Entretiens sur la Pluralité des Mondes' can still be read with much pleasure and to great profit. He had a sort of quiet humor, which gave much piquancy to his air of perfect indifference. Madame Geoffrin once questioned him about his parents. "My father," said he, "was a fool; but my mother had wit. She was *quittiste*; she was a sweet little woman, who often said to me, 'My son, you will be damned.' But it gave her no pain."

The Wednesdays of Madame Geoffrin soon became insufficient, and she had to take another day—Monday. She drew into her circle all foreigners of any eminence, and her house became cosmopolitan. She also introduced the fashion of asking artists, painters, musicians, sculptors, who had hitherto not mixed much with society people, and her house became in this way at the same time more aristocratic and more popular.

#### THE SCHOOLS OF ARCHÆOLOGY AT ATHENS.—II.

##### THE GERMAN ARCHÆOLOGICAL INSTITUTE AT ATHENS.\*

Any account of the German Archæological Institute at Athens must be prefaced by a short history of the Institute at Rome and the *Centralkommission* at Berlin—in other words, of the Institute as a whole; for only then can the motive, the functions, the aims, and the aspirations of so noble and useful a school be made abundantly plain to the American reader; only then can one fully understand what a power it is in all that concerns the advancement of the science of archæology.

The name *Institute* is calculated to mislead and confuse many who are not familiar with archæological matters, for the reason that it is officially applied not only to the directing head in Berlin, the Imperial German Archæological Institute, but also to its two fair children, the Archæological Institutes that are located, the one at Rome and the other at Athens. This confusion would have been avoided if the institutions in Rome and Athens had been called schools. As a matter of fact, in unofficial speech they are often, if not usually, called schools, not only by outsiders, but by those officially connected with them as well, and in like manner the term *Centralkommission* is applied to the Institute in Berlin.

As I have shown already, the French led the way at Athens fifty years ago, and the grand success of France's School no doubt had much to do with the foundation of the German Institute at Athens just twenty-three years ago; but still too much stress must not be laid upon this thought, for, as a matter of fact, Germany, with her Winckelmann in sculpture, her Eckhel in numismatics, her Zoega, Welcker, Müller, Creuzer, Thiersch, Böttiger, Hirt, was clearly the pioneer not only in founding the science of archæology, but also in the establishment of an Archæological Institute, as will appear immediately. In the course of his scientific travels in

Italy in the twenties, the gifted Eduard Gerhard, the semi-blind scholar and enthusiast for everything that appertained to classical antiquity, had been distressed to find that the monuments not only were widely scattered, but were also neglected, abused, and threatened with defacement, if not with actual ruin. It was then that his fertile brain conceived the idea of creating in Rome an Institute of Archæology, whose chief business it should be to study, draw, publish, and in so far preserve, at least to science, the monuments that were so precious for a knowledge of antiquity. Gerhard, with the intelligent and enthusiastic help of Panofka and the Duc de Luynes, developed and perfected the plan or constitution of the contemplated Institute, which was to be placed under the patronage of the Crown Prince of Prussia, Friedrich Wilhelm, who by good chance happened to be travelling in Italy in 1828. The distinguished Bunsen, by reason of his diplomatic position in Rome, and his scholarly enthusiasm, advanced the project materially; Fea and Borghesi gave their sympathy and active help, so that the birth of the Institute was watched over by men whose names sounded well in the earlier decades of this century—men, too, whose names are not forgotten by the generation of to-day. Besides these, a host of scholars from Germany, France, and Italy, along with a few from England, Denmark, and Greece, joined with the projectors in founding the Institute of Archæological Correspondence at Rome on April 21, 1829. The name given to the institution was justified by the fact that it was to be sustained and kept alive by an extensive correspondence on archæological matters, not only from Italy, but from scholars the world over who had anything of interest to communicate. It was therefore an international institution, conceived, indeed, by Germans, but at the start in no way connected with the Prussian or any other state; on the contrary, being wholly a private undertaking, it was dependent for its revenues upon the proceeds of its publications, though more especially upon the generosity of liberal-minded individuals, such as the Duc de Luynes in France. In the earlier years even Gerhard and Panofka often had to put their hands into their own pockets in order to preserve the Institute from a premature death.

In an institution so constituted, friction was to be expected; the Germans, French, and Italians were jealous each of the influence of the others; each nationality claimed precedence and sought to play the leading rôle. Not only that, but about the middle of the thirties a heated war was waged for the absolute possession and control of the Institute; the Germans wanted it removed to Berlin, the Frenchmen to Paris, but in 1836 Bunsen carried the day, and the Institute remained in Rome, fortunately for the larger interests of archæology. A compromise was made between the warring factions by which, thanks to the Duc de Luynes, the French element was allowed considerable independence of action. The quiet thus restored, with Braun as First Secretary (1838-1856), continued unbroken until 1848, the year of revolution, which marked the absolute withdrawal of the French from the struggling Institute in Rome. The reasons for this withdrawal were threefold: the political troubles which beleaguered the atmosphere everywhere in Europe made Frenchmen more than usually

languid in regard to matters of purely scientific interest; then the French School, which had been founded at Athens only two years before, had already begun to divert the French contingent to Athens; and lastly, owing to the continual bickerings between the national factions, the Duc de Luynes lost faith in the permanence of the institution and withdrew his effective support. This step left the Institute in the hands of the Germans and the Italians. But, in spite of adverse circumstances, much good had been accomplished during the first two decades of its existence, as may be inferred from the list of eminent scholars who had been in control of the fortunes of the institute: Bunsen, Gerhard, Panofka, Kellermann, Braun, Lepsius, Abeken, Henzen. In spite of the evident nationality of these men, the German language was forbidden in the meetings and in the publications of the Institute. At that time German was still the barbarous language of the North, whose use would have made the coöperation of other nationalities impossible. The papers intended for the publications were written in Italian, French, or Latin, while the language of the weekly meetings was chiefly Italian, though French and Latin might be used. The publications just referred to were three annual volumes: The *Bullettino* appeared monthly, and dealt especially with archæological news; the *Monumenti Inediti*, a folio volume, contained plates of important unpublished monuments; the *Annali* contained longer papers and discussions of the large plates printed in the *Monumenti*.

Financial troubles were always present, and when Braun died in 1856, these troubles threatened to wreck the Institute; but its life was secured by the devotion of Henzen, who remained bravely at the helm, until the addition of Brunn, as Second Secretary, started the Institute upon a new, and, as the event proved, more successful career. Friedrich Wilhelm had been the protector of the Institute from its inception, and had paid the meagre salaries of the secretaries from his privy purse; but Prussia had steadily refused to subsidize the Institute because it was a private undertaking. However, upon the Prince's accession to the throne, a small annual sum was granted to the Institute from the public revenues of Prussia, though as yet it was not recognized as a state institution.

The powerful and inspiring influence of the Institute had already begun to be felt in the universities of Germany, in all of which, thanks chiefly to the Institute, chairs of archæology had been established. In consequence of this fact, Wilhelm, the Prince Regent of Prussia, felt justified in increasing the annual grant to about \$4,500 in addition to the petty salaries of the secretaries. At the same time two travelling scholarships, founded by private individuals, were thrown open to all German students, provided they had graduated in a Prussian university. And so, after thirty years of trial, the Institute ceased to be a private undertaking and became an institution of the Prussian State. The *Centralkommission* in Berlin became directly responsible to the State, and the connection between the *Centralkommission* and the Institute in Rome became closer. And yet it was not until 1867 that the Prussian State, at the instance both of the *Centralkommission* and of the secretaries in Rome, began to think of assuming absolute control of the Institute. The reasons for this step are not

\*In the preparation of this paper I have been aided most materially by the various writings of Michaelis: his "Geschichte des Deutschen Archæologischen Instituts"; his "Das Deutsche Archæologische Institut in Im neuen Reich, 1870"; his "Das Deutsche Arch. Institut in Athen und die Ausgrabungen in Olympia," also in *Im neuen Reich*; his "Aufgaben und Ziele des K. Deutschen Arch. Instituts" in Vol. 63 of the *Preussische Jahrbücher*. The last article has been published in English in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1889, p. 190 ff.

far to seek: The Centraldirektion wanted state protection of property situated in a foreign country, and the secretaries, by becoming state functionaries, assured to themselves the comforting boon of a pension in their old age: It is interesting to know that this reorganization was finally effected amid the frenzied enthusiasm prevailing at the birth of the new German Empire, and that one of the first acts of Wilhelm as German Emperor was to sign the decree creating the Prussian Archæological Institute in Rome. The signing was done at Versailles on March 2, 1871.

This arrangement did not last long; events now began to march rapidly, for in 1874 the German Reichstag relieved Prussia of all concern in the matter of the Institute, made it national German, and the Imperial German Archæological Institute in Rome was an accomplished fact. At this time, too, the Institute was strengthened in other important ways—by the addition to the Centraldirektion of four archæologists in universities other than those of Prussia, by the creation of five travelling scholarships, each of \$750 a year, and by increasing the annual grant to the imposing sum of \$25,000 annually. But the year 1874 was otherwise memorable in the history of the science of archæology. As we have seen, that year chronicled the final reorganization of the French School at Athens; it also chronicled the inception of the epoch-making excavations at Olympia by the young and ambitious German Empire, thanks to the initiative of Ernst Curtius, and it chronicled the creation of the German Archæological Institute in Athens, thanks again to the initiative of Ernst Curtius. The German Institute, as a whole, became at once the centre of all archæological investigations. Like Athens herself, the Athenian Institute sprang into existence full armed and ready for the fray. Taught by the accumulated experience of half a century in Rome, as well as by the history of the French School at Athens, the Germans could set to work at Athens at once with the consciousness of strength, with well-defined aims, and without having to pass through the usual stage of transition or evolution from a condition more or less chaotic. In the earlier years of its existence the French School at Athens was exclusive, as was also the Greek Archæological Society, but the Germans, in founding the new Institute in Athens, desired that it should be a centre not merely for German, but for international archæological endeavor in Greece. Not that they had in mind to repeat in Athens their memorable experiences in Rome—the cases were different. Being unquestioned masters in their own house in Athens, they could afford to throw open its doors to all the world. The same liberality prevailed at the excavations of Olympia, for all of which the world has to thank the broad-minded Ernst Curtius. Thus by precept and example the German Institute has opened all doors in Athens, and has brought about an era of good-fellowship and of brotherly love in the bonds of archæology that does the soul good, so that, thanks firstly and chiefly to the German Institute, the life of the scholar visiting in Athens is one continued round of supremely blissful, because archæological, enjoyment.

The chief object of the German Institute is to study and publish the precious remains of art of all kinds, to investigate classical

sites in the light of everything that appertains to their topography, their epigraphy, their history, and their existing monuments. Besides these functions the Institute organizes and conducts journeys with scientific objects in view, sends out expeditions of exploration throughout Grecian lands, makes excavations of important sites, and collects and publishes information in regard to all these matters. This does not exhaust its functions, for it must assist not only its *Stipendiaten*, or fellows, but all who travel in Greece for the sake of science, by its advice, its help, and the use of a rich library; it must institute regular meetings for the reading of papers on archæological topics of the day, and see to it that all natives and foreigners interested in the science of archæology are invited to attend.

When the German Institute at Athens was opened, the smoke of the Franco-German war had scarcely cleared away and French sympathizers were numerous in Athens. It was, therefore, a matter of great importance to secure as the head of the new Institute a man who in every way was able to cope with the difficulties of the situation and to unite all men in the furtherance of the interests of the Institute. Now, it is not generally known that, for many years prior to 1870, a trained archæologist had been attached to the Prussian Legation at Athens in the character of secretary. This attaché became a diplomatist, but he also gained familiarity with the people, with all matters of archæological interest in Athens and Greece, and with the ways and means of archæological research in the field and in the library. Now a young professor at the new University of Strassburg had previously been attached to the Prussian Legation at Athens for many years as archæological secretary. His name was Ulrich Koehler, and it was he who was chosen to be the first Director, or Secretary, of the Athenian Institute. He was a man of distinguished presence and tactful bearing, a polished gentleman, though for a German somewhat cold. A past master in epigraphy, in history, and in antiquities, he was, as it were, made for the place, the very man to give prestige and repute to the new Institute. With him, as Librarian, was associated Lolling, who knew Greece better than any other living man, and whose gentle, kindly nature was well calculated to make friends for the Institute.

The archæologists of the olden time were handicapped by the scrappy nature of the material with which they had to work. The publications of fifty years ago, despite their magnificence, presented mere fancy selections from a variety of well-known monuments of art with accompanying fancy letter-press sketches, or else they treated of the contents of isolated museums containing collections made by rich men, who were guided in their purchases solely by accident or the idiosyncrasies of individual taste, but not at all by sound scientific method. Among the earlier archæologists only Visconti, Zoega, and Welcker had so great a command of the whole field as to be able to write works that continue to command respect to-day, when men know that nothing but a thorough classification of all accessible monuments of art, entailing, of course, exhaustive treatises on each special branch of art, can lead to trustworthy scientific results, and so satisfy the universal craving for accurate knowledge. Gerhard, whose

motto was, "He who has seen one monument of art, has seen none; he who has seen one thousand, has seen one," had early led the way with his 'Etruscan Mirrors,' and with his praiseworthy start in the field of vase-painting. He was followed along this line by Lenormant and De Witte in their 'Élite Céramographique,' though neither publication exhausted the marvellous stores, stores that have since then grown to colossal, even mythical, proportions. Clarac, too, was already on the ground with his 'Musée de Sculpture.' The giants of those days may have dreamed dreams of the future of archæology, but what joy would have been theirs had they lived to see the tremendous undertakings of the German Institute, undertakings that have been the direct results of their far-sighted teachings! What a mighty task was the 'Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum' undertaken by Mommsen and Henzen, assisted by other scholars; how much was meant by that other Herculean labor, the 'Corpus Inscriptionum Atticarum,' by Kirchhoff, Koehler, and Dittenberger, both tasks having been undertaken by the Academy with the support of the Institute! Among other monumental works of the kind must be mentioned the 'Rilievi delle Urne Etrusche,' by Brunn, continued by Körte, who also continued Gerhard's 'Etruskische Spiegel.'

These and other vast publications which we cannot particularize here, do infinite honor to the Institute, but they do not seem to represent a methodical series of publications, because they owe their origin in the main to the initiative of individuals whose works the Institute was glad to publish, seeing that each of them formed links in the grand chain of publications contemplated by the Centraldirektion in Berlin. But, as time goes on, the method will appear, for the Institute proposes to present to the world exhaustive classified publications on statues, on pictures, on gems, on vase-paintings, on bronzes—in fact, on every conceivable class and category of ancient monuments. The preparation of each of these works requires toil on the part of a large number of men for years at a stretch, and in all this work the Institute at Athens bears its full share.

The Institute at Athens took rank at once with its elder sister at Rome, not merely because of the prominence of the men connected with it, but also because of the work which it began to do in furtherance of the plans of the Centraldirektion. Its individual periodical, the *Mittheilungen*, corresponded in the main with the *Annali* of the Roman Institute. Meantime the organ of the Centraldirektion in Berlin continued to be the *Archæologische Zeitung*, so that archæological periodicals were being published at three different centres, Berlin, Rome, and Athens, and all were official organs of the Institute as a whole, though each had its own individual task and was independent each of the other. Of course the sphere of action of the Athenian Institute is determined by its geographical position. In other words, it must ever be the headquarters for all explorations that are carried on in the Greece of antiquity, and in this sphere it exerts all its influence to the furtherance of the great tasks undertaken by the Centraldirektion. Both the secretaries and all the students, not merely the Fellows, but a well-equipped body of young men who spend their own money, work along the lines that will most effec-

tively promote the vast undertakings of the Institute, for the idealistic tone of mind which makes men pursue science for the love of it is not yet dead in the world.

Chiefly owing to the ever expanding purposes of the Institute as a whole, the old series of publications had to be abandoned, or rather merged into a new series. Other influences also combined to make such a change imperative: the Italians had begun to publish accounts of their excavations and discoveries in their *Notizie delle Scavi*, thus depriving the *Bulletino* of a great part of its material; then whereas, in former days, Rome was the centre of the art of engraving, the new processes of reproducing art monuments have robbed it of its sometime prominence, so that the removal of the folio publication from Rome to Berlin became a matter of necessity; lastly, when the *Monumenti* were published in Rome, too much importance and space were given to the reproduction of Italian monuments, to the great detriment of the monuments of the more important, because purer and more original, Greek art. Consequently a fundamental change in the publications of the Institute was made in 1886. The *Annali* and the *Archæologische Zeitung* passed over into the *Archæologisches Jahrbuch*; the *Monumenti* became the *Antike Bildwerke*, both being published in Berlin instead of in Rome. The *Bulletino* was merged into a new periodical which, in imitation of the *Athenische Mittheilungen*, was called the *Römische Mittheilungen*, although the memory of the old *Bulletino* has been preserved in the secondary title. In the Roman periodical both the Italian and the German languages are equally favored. The secretaries in Rome and Athens are wholly independent, both in regard to the editing of their periodicals and in regard to the sphere of their activity. The First Secretary in Athens gives lectures, represents the Institute, and conducts the finances. The lectures of Dörpfeld, the present First Secretary, on the topography of Athens, and his annual journeys to the Peloponnesus, the Islands, and Troy, are features of the archæological year, both because he speaks as a man having authority, and because they are truly international in character. The Second Secretary gives lectures, chiefly on art in the museums, edits the *Mittheilungen*, and has the oversight of the library.

The creation of the Institute at Athens was not accompanied by an increase in the number of stipendia or fellowships. The greatest freedom of action is given to the five Fellows: they may spend all or part of their time at Rome or Athens, or they may spend it in scientific journeys to any part of the world, say, to London or Egypt. If they are present in Rome or Athens, the only demand made upon them is that they take an active part in the fortnightly open meetings of the Institute. However, they are expected to pursue some special, self-chosen line of work, and if they have leisure moments they are required to assist the secretaries in observing new facts, and to seize every opportunity to help along the great undertaking of the Centraldirektion. It were well for men in our own School to take to heart and act upon the instructions given to the Fellows. The Fellow must spend the entire year on his *Studienreise*, and at its close he must send to the Centraldirektion an account of how it has been spent. The candidate for a fellowship must have

passed either the Doctor's or the Staats-examen, or both, and a period of three years must elapse between such examination and his proposed entrance upon the enjoyment of a fellowship. The Fellows live in the Institute building, in case non-Fellows (usually ten in number) are not already in possession of the five rooms. The Fellows are not required to take part in excavations, though occasionally they do.

Despite the youth of the German Institute, it can point to a galaxy of distinguished scholars who have been Fellows in Athens, such as Furtwängler, Purgold, Puchstein, Milchhöfer, Weil, Fabricius, Julius, Robert, Schreiber, Dressel, Von Duhn, Körte, Knapp, Von Rhoden, Löschke, Dessau, Schmidt, Wolters, Keck, Schäfer, Hülsen, Schwartz. The Institute is a power on earth for good, and still it is but entering upon its career.

J. R. S. STERRETT.

## Correspondence.

### A FLAGRANT INSTANCE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION.

SIR: Mr. Gerhard Gade, after having served as United States Consul at Christiania, Norway, for twenty-nine years, has had a successor appointed by President McKinley. Four years ago our Consulate at Christiania was threatened by a similar catastrophe, but the urgent and strenuous remonstrance that poured in from all sides proved effective enough to influence Mr. Josiah Quincy to send the new Consul to Gothenburg, instead of to Christiania. Consul Gade was appointed by his friend Gen. Grant, and, next to our Consul at Gibraltar, is the oldest in the service. Our present Government could not make a greater mistake, or an error more calumnious to Americans and American interests, than to appoint a successor to Consul Gade. Leaving out entirely all question of gratitude, recognition of long and faithful service—even of decency—there are many reasons why Mr. Gade is preëminently the man for his place. He belongs to one of the best of Norway's families, and lives on one of the few great estates left in the kingdom, where he offers lavish hospitality to every American. His late brother, Chamberlain Herman Gade, was one of King Oscar's dearest friends. Thus Consul Gade is, in an uncommon manner, able to represent, publicly and privately, America. Furthermore, he is a man who entertains and protects not only because of a sense of duty; with an old-school courtesy, a certain Sir Roger de Coverley quality about him, it has become second nature to him, a necessity. We have not many such representatives abroad, and those we have we can ill afford to lose. We truly must blush at the thought of a man of twenty-nine years of exemplary service, at the height of his vigor, being replaced by the "father-in-law of a Western campaigner."

In the recognition of merit we might, perhaps, be taught a lesson by Norway, whose King, in the twenty-fifth year of Consul Gade's consulship, thought that his services in American-Norwegian interests had been great enough to deserve the Cross of St. Olaf. His many years of office have been one long, continuous account of important services, of kindly interest in all travellers,

and unflagging fulfilment of his duties. Many will hear with burning indignation the indignity done America in the appointment of a new Consul to Christiania, and hope that also this time the President will see his mistake before Consul Gade has been replaced.

C. B.

JULY 12, 1897.

### THE TOBACCO PLANTER'S ESTATE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Coming again, in the article on Washington's wife, in this week's *Nation*, to the usual statement concerning the impecuniosity of colonial Virginia tobacco planters, it occurred to me that I had a rather curious sequence of exceptions to this rule, if it be a rule, among my papers, and I herewith send either quotations or paraphrases of quotations from four wills made in succession by father, son, grandson, and great-grandson, which may interest your readers, both as bearing on the cash on hand in plantation life, and showing the method of portioning daughters in colonial times.

The first will, dated 1710, was made by a man born in the colony about sixty years before. His father's will probably was burned in the court-house of his county some years before the war, and I have no copy:

"Item, I give & bequeath unto my six daughters all moneys due to me in England, Virginia or elsewhere to be Equally divided among them deducting out of Each part what shall appear to be paid to Each of them by my book Ledger No. (4). Item, it is my will & I do order & appoint that in Case my money will not amount to Seven hundred pounds to Each & Every of my daughters before named with what is all ready paid them that then & in such Case all crops of Tob<sup>o</sup> growing on the ground or in the houses at my death be sent to England in order to raise the aforesaid Sums of Seven hundred pounds to Each of my aforesd daughters. But in Case there Should be monys Enough to Comply with all debts & Legacy's Exprest in this will that then & in Such Case the produce of the sd Tob<sup>o</sup> to goe to my three sons."

The three sons under the will took all the real estate. A codicil adds to the above £50 each to the youngest two daughters, and there were other small legacies aggregating a considerable sum.

In 1721 the eldest son of the maker of the last will, having three sons and one daughter, divided his estate between the sons, giving the daughter £1,000, and dealing further on with his cash in hand in a way to show the amount to be considerably above £3,000.

The third will, dated 1756, divides the landed estate between two sons, subject to the sale of specified tracts sufficient to provide £500 for each of six daughters, provided that at the time of marriage or coming of age of the eldest daughter the accumulated cash on hand be not sufficient to pay the £500 to each of the said daughters. As the chief of the tracts directed to be sold has always been and is now owned by his descendants, there is reason to suppose the cash was forthcoming.

In the fourth will in succession, dated 1814, for the first time daughters participated in the division of the real estate. There were seven sons and three daughters. The eldest five sons and the children of a deceased daughter had been portioned before the will was made. The two infant daughters received about one-half each of a son's por-

tion, which appeared, roughly speaking, to be eight hundred acres of land and thirty slaves to each one. After the portioning of all the children, the will directs the equal division among them of the residuary estate, real and personal, but charges the said residuary estate with the payment of £400 per annum, one-half in May and one-half in November, to "my beloved wife" during her lifetime. It is worth mentioning that the executors of the last will gave bond in the sum of \$200,000.

If I were disposed to attach much greater value than I do to the above proof that rich planters were not unknown, I could not forget the existence of the other sort also, as long as I remember the pessimistic view taken by one good old relative of Gen. Washington, the strong lines of whose face used to get curiously tangled with the claws and horns of the lion and the unicorn on the mortuary tablet of Thomas Lord Fairfax over his head to my closing eyes as the preacher in his black gown droned away, from his high pulpit, and sleep overcame me on a hot Sunday in years gone by. Mr. Washington once said to another gentleman, where I heard it: "Yes, sir, I am a farmer; I raise corn, sir; and my hogs eat the corn, and my negroes eat the hogs, and I get what they leave." B.

MARYLAND, July 17, 1897.

## Notes.

John Lane will shortly issue from the Bodley Head Col. John Hay's speech at the unveiling of Scott's bust in Westminster Abbey; 'The Stepmother,' from the modern Greek of Gregory Xenopoulos by Mrs. Edmunds; a parody, 'The Quest of the Gilt-Edged Girl,' by Richard De Lyrienne.

The Macmillan Co. announces 'The Household of the Lafayettes,' by Edith Sichel, and a 'Handbook of Metallurgy,' by Dr. C. Schnabel.

Prosper Mérimée's 'Letters to an Unknown,' translated by Henri Pène Du Bois, will be published immediately by Brentano's.

The celebration of Queen Victoria's Jubilee has tended to retard the publishing of books. Among these is the next volume of Mr. Rawson Gardiner's 'History of the Commonwealth,' and the same historian's answer to Father Gerard's brochure upon the Gunpowder Plot.

The increasing number of visitors to the West Indies from the United States, more especially in the winter time, will be glad to know that Sampson Low & Co. are about to bring out a new edition of 'The West Indies,' the very interesting hand-book, of which the author is Mr. Washington Eves, C. M. G. The new issue will have an entirely fresh set of illustrations, taken from photographs. Mr. Eves is a wealthy London merchant, who owns property in Jamaica, and dispenses a most generous hospitality to West Indians in general, when these visit England.

T. Fisher Unwin, London, has in hand a series of volumes under the general title of 'Builders of Greater Britain.' The editor is Mr. H. F. Wilson, M.A., barrister-at-law, and late fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, who has, until recently, been private secretary to Mr. Chamberlain. Mr. Wilson, who has just been appointed legal

adviser to the Colonial Office, designs that each biography shall give an adequate picture of the builder in relation to his work. The "Builders" will include those whose sphere of activity has been, in the main, administrative, as well as those who have fought and explored by sea and land. Mr. Wilson rightly believes that American readers will not resent the introduction of the names of William Penn and Lord Baltimore, the founders of Pennsylvania and Maryland. Each volume will contain the best portrait obtainable of its subject, and a map showing his special contribution to the imperial edifice. The following is a list of the first eight volumes, with the authors' names, that have been arranged for: Sir Walter Raleigh, by Martin A. S. Hume; Sir Thomas Maitland, by Walter Frewen Lord; John Cabot and His Sons, by C. Raymond Beazley; Lord Clive, by Sir A. J. Arbuthnot; Edward Gibbon Wakefield, by R. Garnett; Rajah Brooke, by Sir Spenser St. John; Admiral Phillip, by Louis Becke and Walter Jeffery; Sir Stamford Raffles, by the editor.

It is now fourteen years since we noticed the first edition of the Messrs. Putnam's 'Authors and Publishers: A Manual of Suggestions for Beginners in Literature,' and said of it that it "ought to be in the hands of every one who purposes to make authorship either a vocation or an avocation." The public verdict has agreed with our own, and the author-publishers now put forth a very elegant seventh edition, considerably rewritten, but consisting in the main of the same subdivisions touching the relations of author and publisher, the method of securing copyright (with the text of the law), and the art of making books, from the preparation of the manuscript to the binding and illustrations. Mr. George Haven Putnam, whose share in this work is the larger, proposes a sort of court for the settlement of disputes between writer and publisher, which he hopes in time might give rise to a body of decisions that would satisfactorily fix the custom for both parties. There seems to us nothing chimerical about this, and it would at once test the reality of the proverbial grievances against publishers.

In connection with the foregoing we may mention a diverting lecture, "Autori e Editori," delivered before the Circolo Filologico of Florence by its President, Piero Barbèra, on March 29, 1897. (Florence: S. Landi). In Italy, it seems, the distinction between printers and publishers is not well understood by authors, who are as little aware of the fortunes of publishers' ventures. A publisher must be content, says Barbèra, speaking from experience, if five out of ten succeed badly or moderately, three or four well, and one extremely well, recouping the losses on the others. In Italy, too, domestic piracy flourishes in the book trade. The lecturer touched upon the evils of advance payments to authors; the choice between a lump sum and a royalty; the practice of taking a work in hand before it is finished and revised by the author; the "incorrigible correctors," like Alfieri and Foscolo, and Balzac; the tricks of authors in selling the same work to different publishers, still known, as in the days of 'Le Diable Boiteux'; the want of intelligence in booksellers; the want of criticism in the reviews (as in Sarcey's in the *Revue Illustrée*); the compulsion of publishers to avoid certain lines (as the house of Barbèra novels), etc. The conclusion is

that the good author makes the good publisher, as the good wife the good husband.

That "year-book of philanthropy," 'Burdett's Hospitals and Charities, 1897' (London: The Scientific Press; New York: Scribners), presents afresh in its eighth issue the rare spectacle of a combination of active discussion and criticism with scrupulously gathered statistics (these last being for the year ending December 31, 1895). The Queen's Jubilee and the charitable movement proceeding from it furnish the opening section of the new matter; and we remark as of interest coextensive with this survey of English, colonial, and American organized benevolence, chapter iii., descriptive and critical of hospital construction in 1896, and chapter xv., giving figures to show the working-class contributions to hospitals, etc.

Kürschner's 'Deutscher Litteratur-Kalender' for 1897 appears in its long-established form, preserving the plan of previous years, and being only a little larger than in 1896 (New York: Lemcke & Buechner). Two portraits serve as frontispieces: the first, of Dr. Max Ring, in honor of his eightieth birthday, the second of Detlev von Liliencron of Altona. The book is a mine of information about living authors, and is of the greatest value to all who desire to keep informed in regard to contemporary literary productions in German.

The Macmillan Co. publish 'Elementary Drawing,' a series of practical papers for beginners, written and illustrated by Elisabeth Moore Hallowell. The little book is not without merit, and the general system pursued is the right one, but it may be doubted if many of the matters treated of are not beyond the comprehension of such "beginners" as the work is intended for, even if they have thoroughly studied the earlier chapters. The attempt to teach "drawing without a master" is a doubtful one at best. There is at least one serious misstatement. Figure 2 on p. 17 is not necessarily false perspective at all, and is indeed exactly such perspective as is given as correct on pp. 10, 11, 12, and 14. It is the true drawing of an object on one side of a picture in parallel perspective, and can be considered false only if the single object is taken as the whole subject of the picture, in which case figure 3 becomes the proper perspective. The author's positive statement that such perspective is "manifestly impossible" must greatly shock and puzzle the poor student who has just been painfully learning that it is not only possible but obligatory.

For an illustration of the specialization of modern law, one may well turn to Mr. Gustavus Hay, Jr.'s, four-hundred-page work on 'The Law of Railway Accidents in Massachusetts' (Boston: Little, Brown & Co.), which treats of the law of negligence as established in that State. Mr. Hay's system of digesting cases under each head of which he treats has been done before, but never, better done for brevity and point. His most interesting chapter is on "reasonable conduct," in the course of which he urges with much justification that while a jury is perfectly competent to judge of "reasonable conduct" in cases of track-walking, or leaning from car windows, others quite different from ordinary questions of fact often arise, in which the norm of conduct cannot be cited, because none exists. In such cases, he says, the jury do not find facts, but legislate a new rule of conduct, often to the

railroad company's loss, and perhaps unjustly. For fairness' sake, he urges, the jury should contain at least one railroad man to present the railroad views, just as every peer was once entitled to the presence of one knight upon the jury to judge his matters. As Mr. Hay says, a military man has little patience with a tribunal of civilians, and a sailor, with a court of landmen; but, interesting as his contention is, it will, we think, be more practicable and more salutary to keep the juries intelligent and honest.

One takes up 'Ruskin et la Religion de la Beauté,' by Robert de la Sizeranne (Paris: Hachette), with anticipations of amusement which are destined to disappointment. A French view of Ruskin should be interesting, but M. de la Sizeranne hardly gives it to us. He abstains from criticism and makes a loyal effort to explain what Ruskin is and what he says, leaving all comment to the reader, and betraying his own dissent only in the caution that it is not the truth, but the opinion of Ruskin, that he is endeavoring to state. To extract a consistent body of doctrine from the multifarious writings of that rhapsodist and poet who mistook himself for a critic, is perhaps beyond the wit of man, but M. de la Sizeranne has produced a picture with many hints of likeness. For the reader of English who has access to Ruskin himself and his more or less authorized interpreters, the present volume is superfluous; but it may well serve a purpose in France.

Admirers of Goethe will be glad to learn of Paul Heyse's poem 'Das Goethe-Haus in Weimar,' in which he gives expression to the reveries that come to his mind on a visit to the house so long occupied by the poet. He recalls the family group with the wife and children, revives the visits of Karl August, Schiller, Herder, Wieland, and numerous other personages who were frequent guests at the poet's home, goes through the various rooms, delighted with their simple yet wisely chosen furnishings, and enjoys the beauty and harmony of the whole place. The pretty booklet of twenty-four pages is illustrated with twenty-one portraits and views of rooms, the garden, works of art, and other articles contained in the house.

Gaederz's 'Emanuel Geibel,' which has just been published as a memorial to William I., is an enlargement of the author's 'Geibel's Denkwürdigkeiten' of ten years ago. The new material comes largely from letters and poems put at the author's disposal after the death of Frederick William, from the collection of the Hohenzollern family, several members of which, especially the Emperor and Empress William I. and Emperor and Empress Frederick, were great admirers of Geibel. This fact, and the dedication of the book to the great Emperor, indicate tendencies that prevent it from being an impartial biography of the poet. The reader is constantly aware of the homage paid the imperial family, and this interferes with his getting a comprehensive view of the poet and his work in general. The author claims to have brought together the most important materials about the poet and to have produced a "Quellenbuch." Frequent quotations are made from correspondence, and many previously unpublished poems are presented with a statement of the circumstances that called them forth. Two good portraits, one in Geibel's early manhood and one for the year 1870, and several autographs adorn the book.

The indefatigable Professor Paul Frédéricq has illustrated the religious history of the Netherlands with an exhaustive essay on the 'Dancing Mania' which formed so strange an episode in the spiritual eccentricities of the fourteenth century. It is issued as an extract from the Transactions of the Royal Academy of Belgium with a very curious facsimile of a procession of Flagellants, from a contemporary MS. of the Chronicle of Gilles Li Muisis. Under his auspices, moreover, is issued a volume containing two essays on the sixteenth-century persecution of heresy—one by the late Jan-Joris Mulder, one of his most promising pupils, on the Inquisition in Antwerp from 1550 to 1566, the other on the Inquisition in Luxemburg by Dr. Julius Frederichs, whose previous labors in this department of history have made his name well known to all students of the subject.

The current number of the *Cosmopolitan* contains an interesting version of Omar's 'Rubáiyát,' in selected verses, by Richard Le Gallienne. The best stanza is perhaps the following:

"So since with all my passion and my skill  
The world's mysterious meaning mocks me still,  
Shall I not plently believe that I  
Am kept in darkness by the heavenly will?"

The melody of this stanza is in marked contrast to the halting monosyllabic verses:

"Oh, come, my love, the spring is in the land!  
Take wine and bread and book of verse in hand.  
And sit with me and sing in the green shade."

The continuation of Le Gallienne's rendering will appear in the next number of the magazine.

A large part of the fifth number of *Petermann's Mitteilungen* is taken up with the Siberian railway and the related enterprises. Gen. Krahmer, in describing the results of the surveys (especially in eastern Siberia) made during 1895, evidently regards the upper Amur region as of little value for colonization. The winters are five and a half months long and the summers are very wet. Rain falls at times for a week without stopping, and in June and September fogs prevail. A cattle plague has also been disastrous, and the principal industry, gold-mining, has declined. Surveys for the line through Manchuria, a thousand miles in length, are being vigorously pushed by Russian engineers under Government supervision, though it is nominally to be built by a private company. When the location is finally determined, a large force of laborers, who have just completed the Ussuri section of the Siberian railway, will be immediately set to work at either end. Chinese railways, which will connect with this line, are projected to Peking and thence to Hankow, to Fusan in Korea, and to Port Arthur. Among the subsidiary works were explorations of the navigable parts of the rivers Yenisei and Obi, which are described by the commander of one of the expeditions. The solitude of these regions is strikingly shown by the fact that the party sailed up the Obi for seven hundred miles without seeing a human creature. On reaching the first habitations, the author says that "great as was the joy on the ships to see at length a shore on which men lived, just so great was the terror of the Ostiaks at the sight of the ships."

The annual report of the Berkshire Athenæum, Pittsfield, Mass., chronicles the completion of an important addition to the library building, giving it now a capacity of about 100,000 volumes, the number at pre-

sent being 29,000. In order to bring the institution into closer contact with the city, there have been added to the Board of Trustees the Mayor, the chairman of the school committee, and the City Treasurer. The librarian, Mr. H. H. Ballard, contributes an account of the various methods of cataloguing, including the common card catalogue and the system employed by the British Museum. That which he has adopted for the additions seems to be a modification of the latter, and consists of "supplementary pages." He suggests that in time, by the aid of the linotype, "all the catalogues of the country shall be made and issued at a reasonable cost by some great central bureau."

Among the manuscripts acquired by the British Museum during the current year, the following may have some interest for historical students in America: 35073: Letters (58) of literary men of the nineteenth century; 35085: Latin Bible, vellum, thirteenth century, duodecimo, from the Crache-rode collection; 35089: Vocabulary of the Aimará Indians in Bolivia, 1866; 35098: Original Entry Book of Sequestrations by Parliament, 1646-1649; 35102: Original Day-Book of Trustees for distributing forfeited lands in Ireland to the Army, 1656-1659; 35107: Original Minutes of the Privy Council, 1695-9, with other papers, 1662-1669; 35117: Original Entry Book of Crown Grants, 1661-1692. In the latter part of 1895, the Museum acquired a collection of manuscripts relating to the family of Walthall of the County of Chester, of which a branch is settled in America, containing itself, however, with but one *t* in the spelling of its patronymic. The papers cover the period from 1351 to 1886, and bear numbers from 34815 to 34818.

On Sunday, June 20, the most famous Danish scientist since H. C. Oersted, Johannes Japetus Smith Steenstrup, died in Copenhagen. Steenstrup was born in Vang, Jutland, Denmark, March 8, 1813. In 1841 he became Lector at Sorø Academy, and four years later he was appointed Professor of Zoölogy at the University of Copenhagen, a position that he continued to fill until his resignation in 1885. For more than twenty years of this time he was Secretary of the Society of Antiquaries, and on the death of Madvig in 1886 he refused the Presidency. He was also prominently connected with many other societies both Danish and foreign, making numerous contributions to their transactions. In proof of the estimation in which he was held abroad, it is sufficient to mention that he received the Prussian order *pour le mérite*, the only decoration that Carlyle condescended to accept. Although Steenstrup's *Hauptfach* was natural history, the direction of his studies brought him in close touch with archaeology through his investigation of the Danish peat-bogs. To the insight of the scientist and the learning of the archaeologist he added the imagination of the poet and the elegance of the accomplished stylist, making a combination of gifts such as has seldom been seen in the history of science and literature. Japetus Steenstrup is not to be confounded with his son Johannes, whose studies of the Danish settlements in England are of first importance.

—The most noteworthy piece in the July Publications of the Southern History Association (Washington) is the reprint of a paper on "John Brown's Raid" by Andrew

Hunter, the prosecuting attorney. We are told that it was first published in a newspaper in 1887, having been written "a few years after the execution of John Brown." The narrative creates a favorable impression of the writer, but it is quite obsolete in its estimate of the magnitude of Brown's force or of the complicity of the North at large in his enterprise. In fact, its greatest value is in its unconscious portraiture of Southern society at the time. When Gov. Wise proposed that the Harper's Ferry prisoners be sent to Charlestown that same evening, Hunter "saw this would not do." The Governor replied: "You have Captain Rowan's company to protect them [from the mob] from the depot to the jail?" "Oh, yes, we have," answered Mr. Hunter, "but that company will massacre every one of them before they reach the jail. My advice is, therefore, don't send the prisoners up to-night, unless you go with them with a party of Col. Lee's marines"—which happened accordingly. Mr. Hunter says, no doubt truthfully, that the story of Brown's kissing a negro child as he left the jail on his way to execution (surrounded by soldiers) is pure fiction; but he answers for the truthfulness of this incident: "While the body was hanging, Strother [*Harper's Weekly's* artist, "Porte-Crayon"] slipped up, raised the cap from the face, and took a sketch of him hanging. He said that the celebrated Lydia Maria Childs [*sic*] had published that she wanted to have a portrait or likeness of Brown in every condition of life to hang in her room, and that he had taken this sketch to send her that 'she might have him too when he was finished.'" Mr. Hunter's amusing proofs of Virginia's panic, in his endeavor to establish the multitude and nearness of Brown's myrmidons, do something to offset the gressomeness of such a performance as this of Strother's. "John Brown's carpet-bag," presumably hidden in the Capitol at Richmond, but sought for in vain, is about all that is left to throw light on the raid.

—The Royal Geographical Society held its last sessional meeting for the year on the 17th of June, in the theatre of the School of Mines, London. A paper was read on this occasion by Prof. York Powell, who succeeded the late Mr. Froude as Regius Professor of Modern History at Oxford, in which the lecturer advocated the establishment of an English School of Charters, similar to the *École des Chartes* at Paris under the direction of the French Government. The paper itself will be found in the printed Proceedings of the Society. At present almost the only provision for teaching the branch of historical science for which Prof. Powell advocates support by the State, is at the universities. Messrs. Poole, Madan, and York Powell lecture upon Palæography and Diplomatics at Oxford; and Mr. Hubert Hall, one of the experts of the Public Record Office, is to treat upon the same subjects at Cambridge next term. Lastly, there is the London School of Economics, at 10 Adelphi Terrace. Referring to the discussion upon Prof. York Powell's paper, a contributor to the *Nation* writes from London:

"It is quite amusing to hear men of science pitching into the Government for not voting money for the endowment of scientific research and instruction. How they snort and sneer at the Chancellor of the Exchequer for keeping a tight hold upon the public purse-strings. Of course they are

quite right in the opinion they hold as to the value of such studies. They do not, however, realize that they must first teach the public the utilitarian nature of their work. A Chancellor of the Exchequer will always find money where the representatives of the people are ready to vote it. In the case of the Nelson dispatches and relics, offered for sale by Lord Bridport, in 1895, both Sir William Harcourt and Sir Michael Hicks-Beach readily acquiesced in the purchase of those memorials of England's naval hero, when the matter was proposed to them by Sir Edward Maunde Thompson, the principal Librarian of the British Museum. The fact is the British taxpayer knows something about Nelson, and takes a very lively interest in the navy, but the voter's interest in ancient writings is not greater than his knowledge of their value to students of history."

—The Society of Friends of Russian Freedom have just issued in their Pamphlet No. ix. an account of the Russian Nonconformists and the treatment meted out to them by the Russian Government, which contains a well-informed summary of sectarianism in Russia. After some discussion of the officially published statistics of religion in Russia, the importance of separating the *Raskolniki*, or "Old Believers," not only from the "Sectarians," but also from the "Orthodox," is insisted upon. The official estimate of the Sectarians of South Russia at two and a half millions is pronounced an understatement. They really number more than four millions. The suppression in official returns of the Lithuanian sect of the "Uniates" is also an error, based upon the recent and over-sanguine declaration that this sect has been converted to Orthodoxy. For these and other reasons it is maintained that, as a matter of fact, the proportion of Sectarians (including in these the Old Believers as certainly not Orthodox) to Orthodox believers in Russia is something like one to six. So far from true is the prevalent impression that the population of the Russian Empire consists of one homogeneous Orthodox mass. The pamphlet further gives a brief sketch of the origin of the *Raskolniki*, who were originally dissenters from the "innovations" of the patriarch Nikon, promulgated in the second half of the seventeenth century. Under Nikon and the Tsar Alexis, they were outlawed. Catherine II. gave them a certain toleration, and in 1822 Alexander I. gave them religious liberty. Nicholas I. reversed this policy. At present they have full legal recognition, and churches in both capitals as well as elsewhere. They have in recent years tended to take the attitude of Sectarians pure and simple, an attitude more or less forced upon them. As to the rise of Russian sects, specifically so called, this goes back to the foreign immigration first encouraged on a large scale by Peter the Great, and more especially to the German Colonies fostered by Catharine II. From among the indigenous "Old Believers" there came, under these new influences, many sects half mystical and half rationalistic, the Dukhobortzi for instance, and the Molokani. The former have rallied around a sort of Quakerism, introduced early in this century, while the Molokani bind themselves to avoid slavery, war, military service, and the taking of oaths. More active of late years has been the spread of Stundism, and the rise of a group of sects more or less "evangelical," which apparently owe something of their hold upon the people to governmental activity in the suppression of dissent; the lamentable inefficiency of the Russian Orthodox clergy has done the rest. Accordingly, it is believed

that there are now a quarter of a million of Stundists in Russia.

—Dr. Fritz Hommel, professor of Semitic languages at the University of Munich, has just published a volume entitled 'Die Altisraelitische Überlieferung in inschriftlicher Beleuchtung,' in which he enters a strong protest against the modern school of Old Testament criticism. A little more than twenty years ago Eberhard Nestle published at Haarlem a work on 'Die israelitischen Eigennamen nach ihrer religions-geschichtlichen Bedeutung,' in which he attempted to analyze the proper names found in the Old Testament and to use them as a means of testing the authenticity of Hebrew tradition. These conclusions were vigorously assailed two years later by Julius Wellhausen in the first volume of his 'Geschichte Israels,' where he endeavored to show that the proper names in the priestly code ascribed to the Mosiac period were, like the code itself, the fabrications of a much later time, and that the inferences drawn from them by Nestle were therefore invalid. In the present volume Prof. Hommel follows out the lines of investigation indicated and partly opened up by Nestle, and brings to bear upon the subject a vast amount, not only of accurate learning, but also of new and valuable material derived from South Arabian inscriptions, for which he is indebted especially to the recent scholarly explorations of Dr. E. Glaser, who unfortunately has published as yet only a small portion of the hundreds of casts and copies in his possession. Hommel's treatment of personal names and their etymological significance is exceedingly acute and exhaustive, and his work is certainly one of the most learned and valuable of recent contributions to primitive Biblical history. Whether his deductions in confirmation of the truth and trustworthiness of Hebrew tradition touching pre-Mosaic times, the prevalence of monotheism and a high state of civilization among the Israelites at that early era, the reality of Abraham as an historical personage, and not a merely tribal designation, the predominating influence of Babylonian in distinction from Canaanite culture, and other kindred topics, will be generally accepted by Biblical critics and the younger generation of theologians, remains to be seen. The English translation published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge in London reads well, and is generally correct, but not always.

—Mr. H. C. Russell, F.R.S., Government Astronomer at New South Wales, has recently issued a group of valuable papers upon interesting points connected with his work in that remote country, not one-seventh of the whole Australian continent. The extremes of its climate he compares with Sicily and Edinburgh—the temperature of the latter prevails at its coldest mountain town, Kiandra, 4,600 feet elevation. The general features of the country are comprised in three divisions. A long strip of coast district contains fifteen large and navigable rivers; back of this fertile and well-watered region, with its abundant rainfall, comes a range of high lands along the mountains, also with plenty of rain, and well adapted for agricultural purposes; and in the west the great plains, with a number of small rivers. A large capital has been expended here in making tanks and artesian wells, though even now the country is hardly

adapted for raising fruit or cereals. Mr. Russell believes in a certain periodicity of the weather; and in a paper read before the Royal Society of New South Wales, he sets forth his theory that the seasons may be forecast years in advance. Floods and droughts are carefully studied from early records, and generalizations deduced from them. A drought in New South Wales is not merely a few weeks without rain, as in England or America, but occasional periods of months or years when, from the diminished rainfall, the country is almost literally burned up, no crops can be raised, and cattle die in large numbers. In countries having a superabundance of rain, even a considerable diminution is hardly noticeable, while in another place, having just enough in the best times, a slight withdrawal makes serious drought. The same causes operate in both cases—great heat and drying winds. From his diagram upon which all droughts in all countries without regard to their intensity were placed in order of time since 1788, Mr. Russell sees marked evidence of a nineteen-year cycle. Going backward still further he finds noticeable verification. The nineteen-year cycle would seem to have been in marked progress not less than a thousand years, and may, Mr. Russell assumes, be trusted to continue and justify forecasts based upon it for a long time to come. A paper upon the ocean currents around Australia is compiled from seventy-six records which had been put into bottles and cast into the sea at various points, and Mr. Russell has charted not the supposed track taken by the bottle, but the shortest line between the points of throwing overboard and of finding. The mean rates of motion over the same ocean are, however, singularly alike. In the case of three bottles set afloat off Cape Horn they seem to have followed nearly the same tracks, and to have travelled 9.0, 7.9, and 10.3 miles daily, over distances of 9,517, 8,617, and 9,585 miles. One bottle going southward made nearly eighteen miles a day. More of these "current papers" are found on the coast between Melbourne and Adelaide than in any other part of Australia.

#### KNIGHT'S WORDSWORTH.

*The Poetical Works of William Wordsworth.*

Edited by William Knight. 8 vols. Macmillan.

*The Prose Works of William Wordsworth.*

Edited by William Knight. 2 vols. Macmillan.

When it was announced, some time ago, that Prof. Knight was about to reëdit Wordsworth, the news was received by literary students with what Dr. Johnson might have called feelings of expectancy mingled with trepidation. Prof. Knight was known as an enthusiastic and untiring Wordsworthian, possessed of a singular faculty for collecting materials and getting at inaccessible things. He had also commanded, for years, the good offices of many close students of Wordsworth, some of them men of learning and acuteness. On the other hand, his former edition (Edinburgh, 1882-86) had not given an altogether favorable impression of his accuracy or his good judgment. The beautiful volumes of this older issue were in every library, and, despite their inconvenient size, in every hand; but, the more they were used, the clearer it became that they needed thorough revision, and the

stronger grew the doubt whether Prof. Knight could ever fit his habit of mind to the requirements of editorial exactness. Ten volumes of the new edition, out of a promised sixteen, have now appeared, and one can arrive at a tolerably correct estimate of the merits of the performance.

Volumes i.-viii. contain the Poetical Works, and have, accordingly, a special title-page. The Prose Works come next, in two volumes. Vols. xi.-xvi. will contain Dorothy Wordsworth's journals, the letters of William and Dorothy Wordsworth, a large amount of bibliographical matter (including an entirely new "Bibliography of Wordsworth Criticism"), and a Life. The Life, we are assured, will be considerably shorter than that published in 1839, for the letters and journals will not have to be included in it. The Correspondence will afford much unpublished matter. Prof. Knight mentions, in particular, the poet's own letters to Wrangham, and more than a hundred letters from Dorothy Wordsworth to Mrs. Clarkson. All this will be worth having, and insures for the new enterprise a respectable position among the books of the century, whatever may be thought of its claims to definitiveness. The two volumes of the Prose Works call for no comment. We shall, therefore, confine ourselves in this notice to the Poetical Works.

Two fundamental questions confronted the editor at the outset: the formation or selection of a text, and the settlement of the order in which the poems should be printed. Both problems are discussed at some length in the preface. For the former, Prof. Knight has certainly reached a correct solution. Wordsworth was continually revising his poetry, often for the better, but not seldom decidedly for the worse. An eclectic text like that formed by Matthew Arnold in his well-known volume of "Selections," would very properly be resented as an impertinence in a complete edition. To take one text for one poem, another for another, was equally out of the question. Accordingly, Prof. Knight has decided to accept the form which Wordsworth himself finally adopted—that is to say, the text of 1849-50—but to register, in footnotes, all the variations, except those of spelling and punctuation, shown by the editions published in the poet's lifetime, or discovered in manuscript. No conceivable objection can be urged against this method, and its advantages are manifest, not the least of them being the opportunity it affords to students of literature to observe the motions of the artist's mind and the artist's hand. Every imaginable kind of shift is represented in these textual notes. The general is substituted for the particular, the particular for the general; homely expressions make way for more elegant ones, conventional elegances are replaced by vigorous bits of homeliness; amplification and retrenchment are alike conspicuous. Particularly interesting are the many instances, in which a word or phrase once rejected finds its way back into a verse, only to be expunged again, perhaps, in the process of incessant revision.

The second problem, that of the order of the poems, is less satisfactorily solved. Wordsworth's own careful and instructive grouping into "Poems of the Imagination," "Poems of the Fancy," etc., is abandoned, and a chronological arrangement is carried through. To the justifying of this procedure Prof. Knight devotes much space in an ar-

gument which, we fear, must be rated among "too curious and striving apologies." His main argument is, of course, that his plan affords special opportunities for studying the development of the poet's mind and art. He does not convince us, however, that a chronological table, like Prof. Dowden's, would not, in this respect, have answered every purpose. We cannot help thinking that no editor has a right to disregard his author's wishes in so deliberate and far-reaching a fashion. From Wordsworth's point of view, an arrangement by dates is, as he once said with much emphasis, "the worst possible," and, however instructive Prof. Knight may find his own new order, most readers will prefer that to which the poet himself gave so much time and pains, and which is in some respects a very significant expression of his critical theories. We need not go into the question at large, for, in the present instance, Prof. Knight's method is condemned by its results. Poems which belong together by every principle of sentiment and association are ruthlessly torn asunder, and yet, after all, consistency is not attained. Especially curious is the treatment of "The White Doe of Rylstone." This is referred to 1808, "although part of it—probably the larger half—was written during the autumn of the previous year, and it remained unfinished in 1810." Consequently, it appears in Prof. Knight's fourth volume. The Dedication, however, was not written until 1815. In this case even Prof. Knight has not sufficient resolution to separate the two, and he has, therefore, printed the dedication along with the poem. When he arrives at the year 1815, however, in the sixth volume, he repeats the Dedication, "from a MS. copy which differs considerably from the final text, and was probably the first draft." Anything more vexatious than the to-and-fro motion thus forced upon the reader it would be hard for the most perverse of editors to contrive. We may mention by the way that Prof. Knight says nothing of the whereabouts of this MS. copy, ignoring the first duty of an editor—the obligation to define the sources of his text. It is his habit, indeed, to insert variants marked simply "MS.," with no hint as to what manuscript is meant. A recent publication has shown that he derived much of this material from the Longman papers, and has incidentally discredited his accuracy as a copyist.

We could wish this were the only editorial obligation which Prof. Knight had neglected or but slightly performed. Unhappily, the omission just remarked is but too characteristic of his methods. The textual notes, to be sure, are much better than those in his former edition, and, though they do not always bear close scrutiny, may be accepted as substantially accurate. Still, in one vexatious instance, they show in a conspicuous way the carelessness, or, at all events, the vacillation, which pervades the work. In printing "Simon Lee" it was clearly Prof. Knight's intention to register variants fully in the footnotes, as usual, and there is, accordingly, no hint in the body of the volume that this has not been done. In an Appendix, however, which, characteristically, is furnished with no backward reference to the page where the poem is printed, we read that "it was found impossible to describe, within the limits of a footnote, the endless shiftings to and fro of the stanzas and half stanzas," and accordingly we have an addi-

tional two pages and a half of textual apparatus. If this appendix formed a part of the editor's first plan (which we very much doubt), the introduction to the poem, or the first textual note, should have apprised the reader of its existence and whereabouts.

If we pass from the textual to the explanatory and illustrative notes, we find a prevailing unsteadiness of purpose and of performance. Take, for example, the matter of imitations and parallel passages. It is no doubt difficult to maintain any consistent principle in calling attention to such things. But Prof. Knight does not seem to have striven to maintain any principle; rather, he has jotted down, somewhat idly, a few passages in other authors that occurred to him or were sent to him by correspondents. Sometimes the parallel is slender enough. It requires a microscopic eye to detect, as Canon Ainger and Prof. Knight have done, a reminiscence of Lady Winchelsea's vivid if ill-finished lines.

"Whose stealing pace and lengthened shade we feel,  
Till torn-up forage in his teeth we hear,"

in Wordsworth's prosaic and ineffective

"The horse alone seen dimly as I pass  
Is cropping audibly his later meal."

Why, too, should it be thought necessary to quote "L'Allegro" when Wordsworth merely mentions Euphrosyne (vol. vii., p. 185)? There is no real allusion to Milton in the passage thus annotated. Quite malapropos is the quotation from "Henry V." made to illustrate a passage in the ode "Imagination—ne'er before content." Wordsworth, apostrophizing the God of Battles, has in his mind a thought very different from that of Shakspeare's king. He is contemplating the great purposes of God as worked out by the hand of man in warfare; in "Henry V." it is the punishment of the individual offender that is in question. Other examples of this kind of annotation might be cited. On the other hand, clear cases of imitation or allusion are not seldom overlooked. In general, we cannot discern that any principle of choice has been observed, or even conceived, with respect to the citation of parallels.

A rather large number of Prof. Knight's notes are of what used to be called the "school-boy" sort. In particular, he has thought it right to explain many classical allusions of a distinctly every-day character. "Leonidas, king of Sparta, killed in the heroic defence of the pass of Thermopylae, B. C. 480"; "The Nine Muses, called the Pierides, from Pieria, near Olympus, where they were said to have been born, or first worshipped by the Thracians"; "Numa Pompilius, the second king of Rome" (there follows a quotation from Niebuhr); "The statue of Amenophis in the vicinity of Thebes—called by the Greeks the statue of Memnon—was fabled to give forth a musical strain when touched by the first ray of sunshine"; "The Hamadryads were supposed not only to haunt the trees, but to live in them, and to die with them"—one is at a loss to decide for whom remarks of this nature are intended. In a school-book of a very elementary kind they might possibly be in place, but in a dignified library edition of an English classic! Yet, even in this point, Prof. Knight has not managed to be steady in his commenting. "Bold Belerophon" falling "headlong from the fields of air" is left noteless by a scholiast who thinks it his duty to explain "the

bright immortal Theban band" and to tell his readers that Alcæus wrote odes, and that "the Julian spear the way first opened" refers to "the conquest of Britain by Julius Cæsar." Besides being elementary, some of these classical notes are vague and feeble. Thus,

"Fabled Cytherea's zone,  
Glittering before the Thunderer's sight,"

if it calls for any comment, calls for a reference to the fourteenth book of the 'Iliad,' instead of which we find the following obscure and ineffectual remark: "It was near the island of Cythera that Aphrodite was said, according to some legends, to have risen from the sea foam. Hence the term 'Cytherea's zone.' The 'Thunderer' is, of course, Jupiter Tonans." To tell the truth, one cannot help suspecting that Prof. Knight is not very ready with his Greek and Latin authors; for, apart from such commonplaces as Leonidas and Jupiter Tonans, he appears to have depended almost entirely on friends and correspondents for his knowledge of Wordsworth's classical allusions. Even for such obvious learning as is required to explain "Laodamia" and to compare "Dion" with Plutarch, the editor relies upon another, and the scrap-book appearance of the annotation is in some measure due to the necessity he is under of crediting to various persons information that ought to have been within his own reach.

In fact, the more Prof. Knight's notes are examined, the more slovenly they seem. Nothing surely can be more familiar than the story of "King Lear"; yet, when Wordsworth, in eight lines of "Artegall and Elidure," summarizes it (from Shakspeare and not from Geoffrey of Monmouth), Prof. Knight seizes the opportunity to insert an extract from Milton's 'History of England' which occupies a whole page of the very finest type. This is mere padding, nor can a more respectful term be applied to much of the five pages of anecdotal matter appended to "The Brownies' Cell." No blame attaches to Mr. Malcolm M'Farlane, patronizingly described as "a very intelligent sheep-farmer in Buchanan parish," for furnishing Prof. Knight with some irrelevant reminiscences of a whiskey-drinking congregation in Scotland. It was Mr. M'Farlane's plain duty to write freely, and he is doubtless as much surprised as we are to find the importance attached to this part of his communications. The letter from Prof. Sellar (vi., 206) need not be called padding, for it helps to fill a page that would otherwise be mostly white paper. Yet we venture to think that Prof. Sellar did not intend it for formal publication.

On the "Fish-women" sonnet we observe a note that is downright amazing. "The name Amphitrite," runs this curious bit of sciolism, "is probably derived from the noise of waters pouring through the rifts of rocks, and there may be an allusion to this in the concluding lines of the sonnet." One might excuse the obsolescence of this comment, but it is not easy to pardon its frigidity. To explain

"Their voices into liquid music swell,  
Thrilling each pearly cleft and sparry grot,  
The undisturbed abodes where sea-nymphs dwell"

as an etymological allusion is certainly an exploit.

Almost as good is the remark, "Here the reference may be to Cædmon's *Paraphrase*," attached to the well-known stanza in which

Wordsworth refers to the hymns of the Druids:

"Not such the initiatory strains  
Committed to the silent plains  
In Britain's earliest dawn;  
Trembled the groves, the stars grew pale,  
While all too daringly the veil  
Of nature was withdrawn!"

If Prof. Knight would refresh his memory by reading a few pages of what he calls "Cædmon's Paraphrase," he would at once admit that it contains nothing to make the stars grow pale or the groves tremble. As to its having been "committed to the silent plains in Britain's earliest dawn," the less said about that the better.

Another instance of lack of penetration is the note on the sonnet entitled "Captivity." "Why this sonnet was printed from 1819 to the last edition of 1849 with inverted commas," says Professor Knight solemnly, "I have never been able to discover." Surely there is no great mystery here. Wordsworth is not speaking in the first person in this poem: it is an ejaculation of Mary, Queen of Scots, from beginning to end. This is the plain reason for the quotation marks, which, we suspect, have never perplexed anybody before.

A few miscellaneous flaws may here be collected. The note on Mithridates and Odin (iii. 137) is vague and feeble: one is left in doubt whether Professor Knight regards the Scandinavian god as an historical character or not. Yet there is nothing really obscure in Wordsworth's allusion. In striking contrast with the editor's indecision on this point is his dogmatic dictum about Stonehenge, which is, we are informed, "a Saxon ring, set up—after the Romans had left Britain—for parliamentary and coronation purposes" (v. 112). To ascribe to Spenser the epitaph on Sidney quoted at i. 267 is a serious error. For Taliesin the reader is referred to nothing better than "Pitæus" and Sharon Turner (vii. 13). What German scholar is meant by "Welcher" (vi. 204) it is not hard to guess, but the misprint is amusing. "De rerum naturæ" (vii. 328) is another ugly slip of the types. At ii. 204, one expects some information about "the German of Frederica Brun"; what is offered instead is an ill-expressed and indeed scarcely grammatical note, with regard to the Scottish ballad "Binnorie," with a misprint in the title given to it by Scott—a note hardly intelligible and thoroughly misleading. At i. 77, "published" should of course be "published in part." At ii. 243, Chaucer's little schoolboy is made to sit *in*, instead of *at*, his primer. Useless repetition is not lacking. Thus, in volume vi. we are thrice informed, in the compass of two pages, that a certain sonnet was published January 28, 1816. Lack of exact references may almost be called a characteristic trait of Prof. Knight's notes. Wordsworth refers to "Tasso" for the phrase *dolcemente feroce*, and Prof. Knight contents himself with a like indefiniteness. Nobody expects chapter and verse from poets, but editors exist for the express purpose of giving them. Other examples of this carelessness are iii. 40, vi. 186, vii. 17, 305, where 'Sartor Resartus,' Gray's 'Journal,' Bede's 'Ecclesiastical History,' and Burn's 'History of Westmorland and Cumberland' are quoted or cited by title merely, with no hint of chapter or volume or page or edition.

It is not to be inferred from all this that Professor Knight's notes are valueless or that all of them are slovenly. As a whole,

those that concern themselves with literary or historical comment and illustration or with exegesis are disappointing, either for what they contain or for what they omit, or from their form. But in three particulars Prof. Knight has done excellent service to literary history. He has collected every scrap of evidence which can help to determine the dates of the several poems and the circumstances under which they were written; he has explained all personal and autobiographical allusions; and he has given much time and pains to Wordsworth's topography. In the last-mentioned particular, the interest of which need not here be insisted on, he has had enthusiastic and intelligent collaboration. The Duddon Sonnets, for example, are accompanied by an elaborate commentary of this kind prepared by Mr. Herbert Rix, and have, also, some brief notes by Canon Rawnsley, whose books on the Lake Country are widely and favorably known. Some readers may think the topography over-minutely studied, but we cannot agree with them. The apparent excess is due to the fact not that too much attention has been paid to topography, but that too little has been paid to some other matters, particularly those of a literary kind.

In closing we wish to provide against a possible misconception. Prof. Knight has, in our opinion, done a great service to literature in his new Wordsworth, and his volumes will long rank as a standard library edition of the poet. Such a work, however, demands a high standard of editorial accuracy and elegance, and to this standard the volumes before us do not conform. Though well qualified to be the general manager of such an undertaking, Prof. Knight should not have tried to work without a colleague, but should have selected some associate who could supply his own serious defects in learning, accuracy, and neatness of literary workmanship.

*The Sense of Beauty; Being the Outlines of Aesthetic Theory.* By George Santayana. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1896.

This book is the best possible complement to Mr. H. R. Marshall's work on *Aesthetics*. Marshall's theories concern themselves with the elementary conditions that make experiences agreeable or disagreeable. Dr. Santayana has but little to say of these conditions; he takes differences of pleasantness for granted, and traces those further conditions that prompt us to regard the pleasantness rather as a quality of the object than as an affection of the self—such "objectivation of our pleasure" being for him the best definition of the "beauty" of the experience. Between them these two authors place our country well in the van of the literature of this fascinating, though profoundly unsatisfying, topic of speculation.

The great merit of both works is the concreteness and reality with which their authors grasp the subject. An artist reading them will not find the deepest instincts of his Being violated as it is by so much of the grotesque stuff called *Aesthetics* in the systems of German philosophers, from Baumgarten and Kant downwards. These American writers, he will say, have been there, and know how I and those like me feel about our work. The stainless exclusiveness and absolute supremacy of an abstraction called Beauty, with a big B, play no part in their pages, and the vast and

shifting play of Man's aesthetic life has consequently a chance of coming to its rights. Dr. Santayana's pages are indeed saturated with so catholic a sensibility for the most diverse sources of aesthetic value that one is almost surprised to find him standing up as firmly as he does in many places for classic determinism of form (which usually is what the Beauty with a big B means) as against that richness in vague suggestion that characterizes romantic work. This just balance in a strongly sympathetic aesthetic nature is what gives to his various critical judgments such luminousness and weight.

After fifty pages on the nature of beauty, in which he takes an ultra empiricist position, Dr. Santayana discusses (in three separate sections) the sensible material, the form of combination, and the expression or remote suggestiveness of things, as being respectively the sources of our pleasure in them. Form is more essential than suggestiveness, matter more essential than form. Here is a passage in which he defends the claims of pure sensation:

"There is no effect of form which an effect of material could not enhance, and this effect of material, underlying that of form, raises the latter to the higher power, and gives to the beauty of the object a certain poignancy, thoroughness, and infinity which it otherwise would have lacked. . . . Taste, when it is spontaneous, always begins with the senses. . . . The simplest people appreciate the neatness of muslin curtains, shining varnish, and burnished pots. A rustic garden is a shallow patchwork of the liveliest flowers, without that reserve and repose which is given by spaces and masses. Noise and vivacity is all that childish music contains, and primitive songs add little more of form than what is required to compose a few monotonous cadences. These limitations are not to be regretted; they are a proof of sincerity. Such simplicity is not the absence of taste, but the beginning of it. A people with genuine aesthetic perceptions creates traditional forms and expresses the simple pathos of its life in unchanging but significant themes, repeated by generation after generation. When sincerity is lost, and a snobbish ambition is substituted, bad taste comes in. The essence of it is a substitution of non-aesthetic for aesthetic values. To love glass beads is barbarous, perhaps, but not vulgar; to love jewels only because they are dear is vulgar; and to betray the motive by placing them ineffectively is an offence against taste. The test is always the same: Does the thing itself actually please? If it does, your taste is real; it may be different from that of others, but it is equally justified and grounded in human nature. If it does not, your whole judgment is spurious, and you are guilty, not of heresy, which in *Aesthetics* is orthodoxy, but of hypocrisy, which is self-excommunication from its sphere.

"Now, a great sign of this hypocrisy is insensibility to sensuous beauty. When people show themselves indifferent to primary and fundamental effects, when they are incapable of finding pictures except in frames, or beauties except in the great masters, we may justly suspect that they are parrots, and that their verbal and historical knowledge covers a natural lack of aesthetic sense. Where, on the contrary, insensibility to higher forms of beauty does not exclude a natural love of the lower, we have every reason to be encouraged; there is a true and healthy taste which only needs experience to refine it. If a man demands light, sound, and splendor, he proves that he has aesthetic equilibrium; that appearances as such interest him, and that he can pause in perception to enjoy. We have but to vary his observation, to enlarge his thought, to multiply his discriminations—all of which education can do—and the same aesthetic habit will reveal to him every shade of the fit and the fair."

Our purpose being not to analyze so short a book, but simply to call attention to its

merits, we will content ourselves with once more quoting. Here is a passage in which Dr. Santayana treats of the quality of remote suggestiveness in objects of art:

"It is the free exercise of our activity of apperception that gives so peculiar an interest to indeterminate objects, to the vague, the incoherent, the suggestive, the variously interpretable. The more this effect is appealed to, the greater wealth of thought is presumed in the observer, and the less mastery is displayed by the artist. A poor and literal mind cannot enjoy the opportunity for reverie and construction given by the stimulus of indeterminate objects; it lacks the requisite resources. It is nonplussed and annoyed, and turns away to simpler and more transparent things with a feeling of helplessness often turning into contempt. And, on the other hand, the artist who is not artist enough, who has too many irrepressible talents and too little technical skill, is sure to float in the region of the indeterminate. He sketches and never paints; he hints and never expresses; he stimulates and never informs. This is the method of the individuals and nations that have more genius than art.

"The consciousness that accompanies this characteristic is the sense of profundity, of mighty significance. And this feeling is not necessarily an illusion. The nature of our materials—be they words, colors, or plastic matter—imposes a limit and bias upon our expression. The reality of experience can never be quite rendered through these media. The greatest mastery of technique will therefore come short of perfect adequacy and exhaustiveness; there must always remain a penumbra and a fringe of suggestion if the most explicit representation is to communicate a truth. When there is real profundity—when the living core of things is most firmly grasped—there will accordingly be a felt inadequacy of expression, and an appeal to the observer to piece out our imperfections with his thoughts. But this should come only after the resources of a patient and well-learned art have been exhausted; else what is felt as depth is really confusion and incompetence. The simplest thing becomes unutterable if we have forgotten how to speak. And an habitual indulgence in the inarticulate is a sure sign of the philosopher who has not learned to think, the poet who has not learned to write, the painter who has not learned to paint, and the impressionist that has not learned to express itself—all of which are compatible with an immensity of genius in the inexpressible soul."

But it seems absurd to quote one page more than another from the book. We recommend it most emphatically as one of the best contributions ever made to the subject—penetrating, perceptive, and judicious, and clad in a superlatively good English style.

*History of Ancient Greek Literature.* By Gilbert Murray. D. Appleton & Co.

Prof. Murray's volume is the first of the series of "Literatures of the World" which is being edited by Mr. Edmund Gosse, and it contains the editor's "General Introduction." We are disposed to believe that there must exist in the soul of the modern book-buyer an insatiate craving for uniformity and correlation, and that the publishers who issue 'Literatures,' 'Heroes,' and 'Epochs' by the series know their public better than we do. Nevertheless, the scholar will always have a rooted distrust of any scheme that would cut out his favorite literature by the pattern of any other. He will find nothing to allure in Mr. Gosse's promise that "great care will be taken to preserve uniformity of form and disposition, so as to make the volumes convenient for purposes of comparison, and so as to enable the literatures themselves to be studied in proper correlation." This will but suggest to him

the estimable efforts of the Chautauqua Reading Circle, for nothing will convince your scholar that a work that is "pleasant enough and picturesque enough to be studied by those who seek nothing from their books but enjoyment," can be to his address. It is nothing less than a slap in the face of the classical scholar of to-day to be told that Greek literature is "independent of philology and political history," especially when Mr. Gosse follows up this remarkable statement with the assurance that, "in preparing these books, the first aim will be to make them exactly consistent with all the latest discoveries of fact."

Let us see how Prof. Murray, in his treatment of Greek Literature, works out this idea of winning both votes. The editor's introduction was framed to catch the vote of the general public; Mr. Murray's preface quietly ignores Mr. Gosse and conciliates the scholar. "Our ultimate literary judgments upon an ancient writer," he says (p. xii), "generally depend, and must depend, upon a large mass of philological and antiquarian argument." He goes on to acknowledge his deep indebtedness to Von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, "whose historical insight . . . has changed the face of many departments of Hellenic study within the last fifteen years." So much for Mr. Gosse's "self-reliant" Greek literature! Mr. Murray's conception of the Greek, as stated in his preface, rejects alike Pater's "æsthetic and fleshly" pagan and the "serene and classical" Greek of Winckelmann and Goethe. Without defining his abstract Greek, Mr. Murray gives us a fairly good negative idea of him—he is, we imagine, the mean of Dr. Johnson's "savages addressed by Demosthenes" and the radiant young demi-gods of Mr. Alma-Tadema's paintings.

In his chapter on Homer Mr. Murray makes more concessions to the learned than to the general reader. Yet we imagine that the scholar who is interested in dialects will seek elsewhere such a close discussion of Aeolic and Ionic as that to which Mr. Murray devotes five pages; in a work which, after all, is meant as a popular sketch, this space might have been more profitably given to quotations from or an analysis of the Homeric poems for the benefit of the general reader, for whom is assumed here a knowledge of Homer which he does not possess. Some account of the classical literary tradition regarding Homer and the influence of the poems on Greek literature and life we look for in vain. Passing to the Lyric Poets, we find scant notice given to Bacchylides, in spite of the recent discovery of several of his odes; here, again, one would have expected Mr. Murray to mention the high place accorded him by the ancients—a place for which it is hoped that the lately acquired poems may account.

The first half of the book ends with an excellent chapter on Thucydides, and the second opens with the drama. Mr. Murray seems to follow Dörpfeld on the question of the Greek stage (see p. 203). The treatment of Euripides is undoubtedly the best part of the book, because the most sympathetically written. Here Mr. Murray gives us the impression that he is really relating his own adventures with the masterpieces that he describes. Your genuine Ibsenite is always restlessly assuring the world that Ibsen is a classic; so Mr. Bernard Shaw announces once a week in the *Saturday Review* that he is vastly superior to Shakspeare; so,

in his turn, Mr. Murray makes the most of his opportunity and classes Ibsen with Aeschylus as a "Titanic mind" (p. 227), and tells us that the "Oedipus Tyrannus" of Sophocles reminds one of Ibsen's plays, because "the interest turns, not on what the characters do, but on their finding out what they have done." Is this fair to the general reader who knows his "Hedda Gabler" and his "Little Eyolf," but will never correct Mr. Murray's analogy by reading Sophocles? For there seems to us to be an immense difference between finding out what you have done (with Sophocles) and finding out after agonies of introspection what you are (with Ibsen). Mr. Murray goes on to compare the symbolism of the "Hippolytus" with the symbolism of "Brand." So that almost before we know it we are left with a trail of Ibsen over our conceptions of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides. This is a good instance of the fallacy of expressing the past in terms of the present; the writer who does this usually adds a qualification, but the reader carries away the wrong impression in nine cases out of ten. Mr. Murray does not follow the modern tendency, at any rate in Germany, to regard Demosthenes as a patriotic agitator whose influence over Athens was fatal and policy short-sighted. Adolph Holm's arraignment of Demosthenes, in his third volume, ought to have some effect on English scholars; Mr. Murray gives his readers the old-fashioned view of Philip as the villain and Demosthenes as the patriotic statesman.

To attack an author for his exclusions and his narrow range in a volume that was limited to 400 pages is so easy a task that the critic is disarmed. He can only deplore the fact that a historian who consents to survey Greek literature in so narrow a space is inevitably committed to the lamentable theory that Greek literature "stopped short at the cultivated court" of Alexander of Macedon. So it happens that Mr. Murray, like so many others, declines into the baldest summary of names and dates for the period following the death of Demosthenes. He allows a dozen pages only to the whole Greco-Roman period, and gives a bare page to Lucian, whom he calls a "second-century sophist," without having pointed out the enormous difference between the sophists of Plato's day and the showy declaimers who, under Hadrian and his successors, taught the art of using the Greek classics to ornament Roman life. To bracket Dion Chrysostomus with Herodes Atticus and Aristides as a "mere stylist" is an astonishing piece of criticism, unless one goes on to explain, as Mr. Murray does not, what an important and picturesque figure Dion's life and his record of it make him in that interesting and too-neglected period.

Of this whole Greco-Roman period we may say that one excellent way of seeing what classical literature was is by estimating what post-classical literature was not. When Dr. Verrall issues his 'Latin Literature' in this series, we do not expect to find in it that "correlation" with Mr. Murray's book so confidently predicted by the editor. For it is only by the study of Greek literature under the Roman Empire that we can understand the contemporary literature of Rome. Mr. Mackail, some years ago, did, brilliantly, for Latin what Mr. Murray has now done for Greek literature; he gave his quotations regularly in the original; and we wish that Mr. Murray could have done

the same, at any rate in footnotes. We are surprised to see colloquialisms, such as "going one better" and "rubbing it in," in a work of serious scholarship which comes from that side of the water on which the Queen's English is supposed to be carefully guarded; the dropping of an "h" in Kirchhoff's name is an unexpected lapse in an author who owes so much to his study of the Germans. But, when all is said that can be said in criticism of Mr. Murray's work, it remains a powerful and original study; *μαμήσεται τις μάλλον ἢ μιμήσεται*—it is easier to criticise than to imitate.

*The Theory of International Trade: With Some of Its Applications to Economic Policy.* By C. F. Bastable, M.A., LL.D. Second edition, revised. Macmillan Co. 1897. Pp. xii, 183.

After an interval of ten years, Prof. Bastable presents us with a new edition of his well-known work on international trade. While it has not been found necessary to make any structural changes, or to alter seriously the original materials, the book has been carefully revised, and its references have been brought thoroughly up to date. The author's first purpose is to subject the classical theory of international trade to a critical examination, and to determine the extent to which it requires restatement. In the opening chapter he considers the reasons that led English economists to formulate a special theory of exchange to explain the facts of international trade, and concludes that there are still substantial grounds to justify such procedure. Then he elaborates the doctrines of comparative costs and of the equation of reciprocal demand. The treatment of these subjects follows closely the traditional methods of presentation, but on some minor points a few oversights of other writers are corrected. Concerning the movements of money in international commerce, the author holds firmly to the supply-and-demand theory. Like all other writers upon this particular subject, he is unable to find a substitute for "the quantity theory of money." The last half of the work is devoted mainly to a consideration of the question of free trade and protection, to which the author applies consistently the theory that he has elaborated, even if he is unable to advance much that can be called original.

Undoubtedly such a book as this serves a useful purpose, but its methods of presentation are such as to limit its serviceableness in all except purely scientific circles. The author rightly enough directs his attention mainly to permanent results and to what holds true in the long run. He treats international trade as barter, and works out the theory of comparative costs in terms of units of sacrifice incurred in production. Such a procedure possesses scientific validity, but lacks the features that appeal to the understanding of those persons who have not had considerable training in economic studies. The man of business is confronted usually by the temporary results of economic causes. He knows that most international transactions are carried on by individuals, not by nations as such, and that international trade seems to be based upon differences of prices which are easy to understand. Moreover, he insists that exports are sold for money, and that imports are paid for in the same manner. If the subject

were one of purely academic interest, the economist might fairly overlook these facts; but its practical importance is so great that care should be taken to throw scientific discussion into a form that will be intelligible to persons who are not scientists. This it is not impossible to do. A little attention to immediate and temporary results, a statistical demonstration of the fact that, in spite of immediate appearances, imports do pay for exports in the long run, and a translation of the doctrine of comparative costs into the language of prices, would accomplish this end. The theory of international exchange may be made comprehensible to any intelligent man by such a mode of treatment, while all scientific purposes may be subserved equally well. Since Prof. Bastable fails to do this, his interesting and valuable book will, like most other works on this subject, end in little more than purely academic discussion.

*Histoire de l'Ordre Lotiforme: Étude d'Archéologie Égyptienne.* Par George Foucart, Licencié en Droit, Ancien Inspecteur des Fouilles et des Musées de l'Égypte, etc. Paris: Ernest Leroux. 1897.

The columns in Egyptian architecture have tempted archaeologists, from De Quincey down, to discussions and theories, all turning to account in some way the manifest reminiscences of floral and vegetable prototypes which they display. There is a very obvious relation between the column as we find it and the innumerable representations of it in bas-reliefs and papyri. But there has been a gap which could not be filled up between the picture and the real thing; for though we have abundant remains of early Egyptian building, we have had no columns which could be dated farther back than about half way in the series—that is to say, to the twelfth dynasty. Those in the hypogees at Beni Hassan have been recorded in every book on the archaeology of Egypt as the oldest in the world; but excavations at Abusir, three or four years ago, revealed a column of the so-called lotus-bud type in a mastaba or tomb which is clearly identified as a tomb of the fifth dynasty, so that it may be five hundred years earlier than those at Beni Hassan, or, according to some chronologies, eight hundred or a thousand. This discovery, of which an account was published in the *Revue Archéologique* in 1894, by M. De Morgan, has been used by M. George Foucart as the text for a careful monograph on the lotiform order.

The lotiform column predominates in Egyptian architecture: it is that of which the consecutive forms can be most clearly traced, the prevailing one in pictured representations, and, so far as evidence went, even before the discovery of Abusir, the oldest. M. Foucart traces its history in a way that was till now impossible. The actual prototype he believes to have been a wooden column, and he accepts the natural theory that the capital is an imitation of the bunches of lotus which the flower-loving Egyptians used to tie about the tops of the shafts. The theory of a metallic prototype, or even of floral ornaments of metal fastened to the top of the original column, stoutly maintained by Chipiez, he absolutely rejects, and with reason, we think. Tracing the gradual modification of the type in historical examples, he finds not only, as was to be expected, that it diverges steadily from the

floral original, but that it falls away as steadily from the beauty of the oldest example at Abusir. This accords with what we know of Egyptian art, in which the elusive period of maturity continually recedes before investigation till there seems no room in history for the time of preparation. The new-found column not only is singularly clear and precise in its representation of a group of half opened lotus buds tied about the top of a fourfold shaft, but has a purity of outline and grace of proportion which are not matched in the later ones. The gradual transformation from imitative forms to purely lithic is shown with unexpected and convincing continuity in the successive examples which M. Foucart has collated, tracing the lotus-column down from the strongly naturalistic monoliths of Abusir and Beni Hassan to the huge and smoothly stuccoed pillars of the Ramassides at Karnak and Medinet Abu—amorphous forms which have so lost the lotus character that some archaeologists have called them papyrus-bud columns. He does not convince us when he insists that the clustering of the stone column is simply a development of the square stone pier, dismissing the theory that it is inherited from the wooden original in an argument whose cogency we do not recognize; but he seems right in rejecting the theory of Lepsius and others that the column was born of an attempt to embody the whole growth of the plant, arguing that it began with the buds at the capital, and that the rest was an afterthought of the middle Empire.

M. Foucart keeps close to his main line of discussion, with but slight notice of the other well-known Egyptian types—the palm-leaf, the papyrus or bell-capital, the Hathor capital—but he has many interesting things to say of the development and progressiveness of Egyptian architecture, too often thought of as the type of immutability. We have not seen so adequate and satisfactory a discussion of any phase of Egyptian architecture as this book.

*Griechische Geschichte.* Von Julius Beloch. Strassburg: Trübner. 2 vols. 1893 and 1897.

An admirable feature of this work is its unity of plan. The reader of Beloch's history will be delighted to find himself pursuing, not the separate narratives of the leading cities, as Sparta, Athens, and Syracuse, but the history of Greece as a whole. Here is great improvement in the treatment of Grecian history, made more practicable, to be sure, by the moderate compass of the work, yet highly creditable to the author. It is to be hoped that future writers will in this respect work along the lines that Beloch has sketched. Equally commendable is his idea of making civilization rather than war the centre of interest. We owe to Greece our science, our art, and our ideals of political and intellectual liberty; how disappointing it is, then, in approaching almost any one of the smaller histories of Greece, to find but a dreary wilderness of military details! But Beloch has restricted himself more than any previous writer to the lessons which ancient Greece has to teach the moderns; he has described briefly the intellectual, moral, and æsthetic conditions of each stage in the development of the race, and has pointed out the influence of these conditions on society and government. It is, perhaps, in treating

the economic side of Grecian history that Beloch shows most originality and ability, and has made his largest contribution to existing knowledge. His service in this is especially opportune at the present time, when economic questions are of supreme interest.

His method is critical—he bases his treatment on a careful examination and estimate of the sources; he is the pronounced foe of "mere hypothesis." In some instances, however, he has not lived up to his own ideal. We find him occasionally offering conjecture as unconditioned fact. On the other hand, he often pushes his critical method to extremes, thus relegating well-evidenced facts to the limbo of myth. This criticism should not apply to his disbelief in a Dorian migration. The theory of a Dorian conquest of the Peloponnesus, though not utterly overthrown by Beloch, has experienced a severe shock at his hands, and with it those "aristocracies based on conquest" of which too much has recently been made. Sometimes Beloch seems unjust in his judgment of men and political parties. For instance, he assumes without convincing evidence that Pericles precipitated the Peloponnesian war to extricate himself from political complications at home. And in his treatment of the Athenian democracy, he does not seem to be aware that its faults were not peculiarly democratic, but are to be found recurring in other forms of government, ancient and modern. This unfairness comes in part from his too confident use of partisan literature as evidence. The theory that each form of government has its peculiar ethical flavor—a theory very attractive to the Greeks—is no longer tenable. Yet if comparisons are of any value, no one acquainted with the facts could say that the Athenian democracy was less moral or less humane than the Athenian oligarchies, the Spartan aristocracy, or the monarchy of Philip and Alexander. But Beloch confesses that he is politically biased by his surroundings: "ein begehrlisches Proletariat und ein ebenso begehrlisches Junkertum" have led him to sympathize with Theramenes's attempt to restrict the Athenian franchise to those possessed of a certain property qualification, an attempt to straiten still further the life of a city-state already dying of political illiberality. Beloch offers nothing substantial to prove that Theramenes's ideal was either good in itself or practicable. In short, he represents the anti-democratic tendency now prevalent in the treatment of Grecian history.

We miss also in Beloch's work the interest and inspiration that come from contact with the brilliant personalities of Greece. In the prominence which he gives to the race, the individual recedes into the background. Lycurgus, Pericles, and Alexander have indeed been overdone, and it is well to call attention to other things in history than the doings of eminent men; but Beloch appears to have underestimated the influence of great personalities on their age. Also, the reader of conventional Greek history will be constantly surprised at Beloch's treatment of leading characters. He will find Dionysius I., once the bloody tyrant of Syracuse, now cleanly washed and habilitated as becomes a great general, statesman, and tragic poet; Eubulus, a prudent statesman wisely developing and conserving the resources of his country; and Epaminondas, still one of the ablest military leaders of all time, yet lack-

ing in statesmanlike foresight and breadth of view, introducing no new principles into politics, but only aggravating the evils of city hegemony. Beloch's treatment of the political tendencies of the fourth century is fresh and suggestive; and indeed his entire work shows a thorough mastery of the available sources, a discrimination in the selection of material, and on the whole a moderation and soundness of judgment that will make it an indispensable help to every careful student of Grecian history.

## BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Barbèra, P. *Autori e Editori*. Florence: S. Landi. Bompiani. Sophia V. A Short History of the Italian Waldenses. A. S. Barnes & Co. Broughton, Rhoda. *Dear Faustina*. Appletons. \$1. Brown, J. S. *Partisan Politics: The Evil and the Remedy*. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co. Burdett, H. C. *Hospitals and Charities*. 1897. London: Scientific Press; New York: Scribners. Campbell-Praed, Mrs. Milma. *An Anglo-Australian Romance*. Appletons. \$1. Chaplin, Anna A. *The Story of the Rhinegold. Told for Young People*. Harpers. \$1.25. Crosby, Frances J. *Bells at Evening, and Other Verses*. Chicago: Biglow & Main. Currie, Mrs. Margaret G. *John Saint John and Anna Grey: A Romance of Old New Brunswick*. Toronto: William Briggs.

Daughters of Æsculapius: Stories Written by Alumnae and Students of the Woman's Medical College of Pennsylvania. Philadelphia: G. W. Jacobs & Co. 75c. Davies, Helen. *The Reveries of a Spinster*. F. T. Neely. Doniol, Henri. M. Thiers, le Comte de St. Valier, le Général de Manteuffel. *La Libération du Territoire*. 1871-1873. Documents inédits. Paris: A. Colin & Cie. Drummond, Prof. Henry. *A Life for a Life, and Other Addresses*. F. H. Revell Co. 25c. Dubois, Marcel, and Guy, Camille. *Les Régions Tropicales*. [Album Géographique.] Paris: Colin & Cie. Dunning, E. J. *The Genesis of Shakspeare's Art: A Study of His Sonnets and Poems*. Boston: Lee & Shepard. \$2. Findlay, J. J. *Arnold of Rugby: His School Life and Contributions to Education*. Cambridge: University Press; New York: Macmillan. \$1.50. Foster, R. F. *Complete Hoyle: An Encyclopedia of All the Indoor Games*. F. A. Stokes Co. Fowler, N. C. *Jr. Fowler's Publicity*. New York: Publicity Publishing Co. Fredericq, P. *De Secten der Geselaars en der Dansers in de Nederlanden tijdens de 14de eeuw*. Brussels. Gibson, W. H. *Eye Spy: Afield with Nature among Flowers and Animate Things*. Harpers. \$2.50. Gillis, J. A. *The Hawaiian Incident: An Examination of Mr. Cleveland's Attitude toward the Revolution of 1893*. Boston: Lee & Shepard. 75c. Fair, Kind and True. By Junius, Jr. Scranton, Pa.: "Republican" Print. Higginson, Ella. *From the Land of the Snow-Peaks: Tales from Puget Sound*. Macmillan. \$1.50. Hillhouse, Lizzie P. *House Plants, and How to Succeed with Them*. New York: A. T. Delamare Publishing Co. \$1.

Horton, George. *Constantine: A Tale of Greece under King Otho*. Chicago: Way & Williams. 1.25. Hovey, H. C., and Oall, R. E. *The Mammoth Cave of Kentucky: An Illustrated Manual*. Louisville: J. P. Morton & Co. 50c. Kerr, Joe. "The World Over." G. W. Dillingham & Co. 50c. King, Rev. H. M. *The Baptism of Roger Williams: Providence*. Preston & Rounds Co. Miller, Mrs. Jeannette. *The Philosopher of Driftwood: A Novel*. Washington: Jeannette Miller Publications. \$1.50. Morley, Margaret W. *A Few Familiar Flowers*. Boston: Ginn & Co. 70c. Morris, W. O. C. *Hannibal, Soldier, Statesman, Patriot*. Putnam. \$1.50. Mulder, J. J., and Fredericks, J. *Twee Verhandelings over de Inquisitie in de Nederlanden tijdens de 16de eeuw*. Ghent: J. Vuytsteke. Mulock, Miss. *The Half-Caste*. M. J. Ivers & Co. 25c. Muriella; or, Le Selve. By Ouida. Boston: L. C. Page & Co. \$1.25. Oliphant, Mrs. *The Ways of Life: Two Stories*. Putnam. \$1. Ramsay, Prof. W. M. *Impressions of Turkey during Twelve Years' Wandering*. Putnam. \$1.75. Ross, Albert. *Their Marriage Bond*. G. W. Dillingham & Co. \$1. Terhune, A. P. *Columbia Stories*. G. W. Dillingham & Co. 50c. *The Life of Victoria Our Queen. Simply Told for Children*. F. Warne & Co. Traill, H. D. *Social England. Vol. VI. From Waterloo to 1885*. Putnam. \$3.50. Travel in 1791 and 1792. Pennsylvania, New York and Vermont: Journals of John Lucklaen. Putnam. \$2.50. Tyler, Prof. C. M. *Bases of Religious Belief, Historic and Ideal*. Putnam. \$1.50.

"Written with a skill that loses nothing of its effect through being accompanied by an air of freshness, this group of three stories suggests that the author could write as many more and never allow his spirits to flag. Nor would his inventiveness weaken. Apparently there is no limit to it. The situations in these plots grow funnier and funnier. In the last Mr. Foster rises to heights of comicality. Moreover, he never ceases to be plausible. . . . He contrives to body forth his most fantastic personages in a realistic manner. . . . A volume to captivate and to leave a pleasant memory behind."

N. Y. TRIBUNE, on

## SPANISH CASTLES BY THE RHINE.

By DAVID S. FOSTER. With 12 full-page Illustrations. Buckram Series. 75 cents.

**HENRY HOLT & CO.,**  
29 WEST 23D STREET, NEW YORK.

## Yale Mixture.

### A GENTLEMAN'S SMOKE.

You won't know the luxury of Pipe-Smoking until you use Yale Mixture.

A two-oz. trial package, postpaid, for 25 cts.

**MARBURG BROS.,**  
The American Tobacco Co., Successor,  
Baltimore, Md.

JUST READY.

## The Victorian Era.

By P. ANDERSON GRAHAM, author of "The Red Scour," etc. An account of the progress and growth of the British Empire during the Queen's reign. With seventy-four illustrations and two Maps. 12mo, cloth, ornamental, gilt edges, \$1.00.

Sold by booksellers. Sent, postpaid, on receipt of price, by the Publishers.

**LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO.,**  
91-93 Fifth Avenue, New York

A **DESCRIPTIVE CATALOGUE**, giving Contents and Critical Opinions of the 528 books from Houghton, Mifflin & Co.'s List included in the Model ("A. L. A.") Library exhibited at Chicago, will be sent to any address. 4 Park St., Boston.

## Educational.

(Continued from page 11.)

### NEWPORT, R. I.

## Small Boarding School for Boys

**JOHN B. DIMAN** (Harvard, A.M.), Head Master. Preparation for any College or Scientific School. Circular and references sent upon application.

## Williamsport Dickinson Seminary.

Both sexes. Regular and Elective Courses. Degrees conferred. Fits for College. Music, Art, Modern Languages, specialties Steam heat, electric light, home comforts. Write for catalog. E. J. GRAY, D.D., President, Williamsport, Pa.

## CHELTENHAM MILITARY ACADEMY

On the summit of the Cheltenham Hills, near Philadelphia. Pennsylvania's leading college-preparatory boarding-school, under the military system. 70 cadets; 10 resident instructors. Illustrated catalogue. **JOHN C. RICE, Ph.D.,** Principal.

## ABBOT ACADEMY For Young Ladies

Begins its 69th year September 16, offering enlarged opportunities. Three Seminary Courses of studies and a College-fitting Course. Address Miss **LAURA S. WATSON, Prin.,** Andover, Mass.

### ST. AGNES SCHOOL.

Under the direction of Bishop Doane. Preparation for all colleges. Special Studies and Courses of College Study. Special advantages in Music and Art. Gymnasium. Miss **ELEN W. BOYD, Prin.,** Albany, N. Y.

### THE CAMBRIDGE SCHOOL.

A Select School for Girls. Comforts of home. Mr. **ARTHUR LUMAN** is the Director. CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

## 1875 SUFFOLK MILITARY ACADEMY. 1897

A healthful and delightful Virginia home for boys. Its pupils are now filling high positions in 20 states. Instructors of experience from Harvard and the University of Va. **JOSEPH KING, A.M.,** Prin., Suffolk, Va.

## School Agencies.

### ALBANY TEACHERS' AGENCY.

24 State St., Albany, N. Y.—Provides schools of all grades with competent teachers. Assists teachers in obtaining positions. **HARLAN P. FRENCH, Manager.**

### FOR COLLEGE POSITIONS

IN THE WEST. Apply to **ALBERT & CLARK, Pullman Building, Chicago.**

### SCHERMERHORN'S TEACHERS'

Agency. Oldest and best known in the U. S. Established 1855. 3 E. 14th St., N. Y.

An Agency is valuable in proportion to its influence. If it merely hears of vacancies and tells that is something, but if it is asked to you about them, it recommends a teacher and recommends you, that is more. Ours **Recommends** C. W. BARDEEN, Syracuse, N. Y.

## Teachers, etc.

### AN EPISCOPALIAN CLERGYMAN

wishes to receive into his family two youths or young men for preparation for the forwarding in their college or other educational course. An exceptional climate permits such work under the most favorable conditions, and the most thorough, conscientious oversight of study, as well as instruction, is assured. The pupils of the gentleman have always gone beyond their class, and have attained fine physical condition.

Golf, tennis, and basketball clubs afford means of daily outdoor exercise; instruction and practice in horsemanship riding, with so much of the military setting-up drill as the daily inspection by a fine physician connected with the U. S. Army deems conducive to health and of use in forming an erect, easy carriage; lessons in dancing and attendance (unless otherwise desired) at the informal post-hops are great factors in the same direction. A large, well-furnished house, abundant pure water, well-ventilated sleeping room, good library, quiet, refined home life; abundant, well-served table, and constant, careful supervision of clothing, and everything conducive to the comfort of pupils will be given.

The terms, including use of a piano if desired, instruction in German and French by native teachers, are one thousand dollars (\$1,000) per year, one-half in advance, balance at the commencement of last half of year. Will take them September or earlier if desired. Address "INSTRUCTOR," Fort Logan, Colorado. Full particulars given by mail, or will welcome a personal discussion if desired.

### LECTURER ON THE FRENCH LANGUAGE

and Literature required for Victoria College, Toronto. Must be an experienced teacher and competent to give instruction in the French Language as required by the Curriculum for the B.A. degree in all Departments of the University of Toronto. Duties to begin with opening of session, 1897-98. Applications, with testimonials, to be sent before August 1 to **N. BURWASS, LL.D., President,** Victoria College, Queen's Park, Toronto.

### A SPECIALIST IN MODERN LANGUAGES

History, Literature, and Political Science, native of Hanover, Germany, Ph.D., A.M., Graduate of Vienna, Paris, and Kentucky Universities, desires a professorship in a good college; 20 years' experience; finest references; moderate salary. Apply **WINFIELD BUSINESS AND ACADEMIC COLLEGE,** Winfield, Kansas.

### A VERY SUCCESSFUL TEACHER,

having given up his position for the special study of Greek and German abroad, is open for an engagement. Would also teach Latin or History. Best references. Ph.D., care of the Nation.

### CLASSICS, HISTORY.—An experienced

and successful teacher, A.B. of a Northern College, Ph.D. of Johns Hopkins, now professor in a Southern College, wishes position in Northern College or School. Address M. M., care the Nation.

### TUTORING IN MATHEMATICS, AS-

tronomy and Physics at pupil's residence. F. H. SAFFORD, Ph.D., Instructor in Harvard University. Address Box 45, Andover, Mass.

### AMERICAN SCHOOLBOYS to Sixteen.

—A Talk with Parents on a Course of Education, by EDWARD ROTH, A.M. 30 pp. Mailed to any address on receipt of 10 cts. 1135 Pine St., Philadelphia.

### LIBRARIAN OF UNIVERSITY LI-

brary, nine years' experience, seeks another position. Address "LIBRARIAN," care Nation.

**CHARLES W. STONE, Tutor for Har-**vard. 68 Chestnut Street, Boston.